FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-147
Wednesday
2 August 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-147 CONTENTS *2 August 1989*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Begins Removing INF Missiles From UK Base *[TASS]* 1
USSR Implementing INF Pact, Destroying Missiles *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Aug]* 1
General 'Satisfied' With Conventional Arms Talks *[Sofia OTECHESTVEN FRONT 28 Jul]* 1
Negotiator Sees 'Progress' in Chemical Arms Talks *[Moscow Radio]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

UN Delegate Decries U.S. 'Annexation' of Palau *[TASS]* 4
Rogachev, TV Panel Discuss Asia-Pacific Issues *[Moscow TV]* 4
Observers Discuss Cambodia, NATO, Afghanistan *[Kornilov, Agayants, Kassis on Moscow Radio]* 10

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush Vetoes Congress Resolution on FS-X Plane *[TASS]* 16
Congress Cuts Budget for 'Stealth,' SDI *[Moscow Radio]* 16
U.S. Congress Military Budget Debate Cited *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jul]* 17
U.S.-USSR Military Contacts 'On the Up' *[IZVESTIYA 29 Jul]* 17
Goranskiy on U.S. Secret Installations *[Moscow TV]* 19

China

Blagoveshchensk, Heihe Get Radio Telephone Link *[Moscow TV]* 19
Moscow Radio Interviews Song Jian *[Moscow International]* 20

Northeast Asia

Outcome of Japan's Upper House Elections Noted *[Moscow International]* 21
Fisheries Minister Ends Visit to Japan *[TASS]* 21
Lukyanov, Primakov Receive DPRK Delegation *[TASS]* 21
DPRK Legislators Visit Uzbekistan *[PRAVDA 27 Jul]* 22
ROK Business Delegation Visits Moscow *[TASS]* 22
Commentary on U.S.-ROK Security Conference *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 25 Jul]* 22

Near East & South Asia

Further Reportage on Shevardnadze's Visit to Iran 23
    More on Discussion With Velayati *[TASS]* 23
    Visit Summarized *[TASS]* 23
    Shevardnadze Ends Visit *[TASS]* 25
    Returns to Moscow *[TASS]* 25
Commentary on Relations With Iran *[Solton on Moscow International]* 25
Gorbachev Sends Message to Rafsanjani *[PRAVDA 2 Aug]* 26
Soviet-U.S. Talks on Afghanistan Termed 'Frank' *[TASS]* 26
    Talks End in 'Failure' *[Stockholm Radio]* 26
    More Commentary on Talks *[Kozyakov on Moscow International]* 27
World Reacts Sharply to Report of Higgins Killing *[Moscow International]* 27
    Report of Higgins Killing Viewed *[Glukhov in PRAVDA 2 Aug]* 28
Politicization of Muslim Hajj Pilgrimage Discussed *[Moscow International]* 28
Conference Still Best Bet for Mideast Peace *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jul]* 30

Gerasimov Cited on Tarasov Visit to Israel *[Abu Dhabi AL-ITTIHAD AL-USBU'I 27 Jul]* 31

East Europe

Kiszczak Named Polish Prime Minister *[TASS]* 32
Polish Economic Problems, Decision Noted *[Moscow Radio]* 32
Romanian Papers Publish Ceausescu Interview *[PRAVDA 28 Jul]* 32

West Europe

Yazov's UK Visit Activities Reported *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jul]* 32
Negotiator Views USSR-EEC Cooperation *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 27 Jul]* 33
UK Air Vice-Marshal Interviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Aug]* 35
Turkish Bank Signs for Import Loan to USSR *[Ankara Radio]* 36
USSR, Belgian Experts Investigate MiG Crash *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 16 Jul]* 36
  Officer Interviewed on Crash *[TRUD 15 Jul]* 36

Latin America & Caribbean

Castro Delivers Moncada Anniversary Speech *[PRAVDA 28 Jul]* 38
Castro Notes 'Difficulties' of Socialism *[Moscow TV]* 38
Cuban Officers' Arrest Reported *[PRAVDA 2 Aug]* 38
Castro's Political Style, Tactics Profiled *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 26 Jul]* 39
Ortega Receives Support for Contra Stand *[TASS]* 40

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Supreme Soviet on Pensions, Nuclear Moratorium 41
  Gorbachev Addresses Supreme Soviet *[Moscow Radio]* 41
  Gorbachev Answers Questions *[Moscow Radio]* 48
  Gorbachev on Nuclear Moratorium *[Moscow TV]* 52
  Discusses Afghan War Veterans *[Moscow TV]* 52
  Committee Chairman on Youth *[Moscow TV]* 53
  Medvedev Reports on Gdlyan Case *[Moscow TV]* 53
  Ryzhkov, Gorbachev on Pension Law *[Moscow TV]* 54
  Deputies Call for Nuclear Moratorium *[TASS]* 55
  Text of Moratorium Appeal *[TASS]* 55
  Local Soviet Sessions Recommended *[TASS]* 56
  Pension Increases Approved *[TASS]* 56
  Akhromeyev on U.S. Visit *[TASS]* 57
Supreme Soviet 31 Jul Session Discusses Taxes 57
  Deputy Attacks 'Racketeering' *[Moscow TV]* 57
  Deputy Calls for Unified Tax Law *[Moscow TV]* 58
31 Jul Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported 58
  Deputies Discuss Taxes, Cooperatives *[Moscow TV]* 58
  Cooperative Tax Bill Studied *[Moscow TV]* 59
  Details of Tax Law Discussed *[Moscow TV]* 59
  Tax Amendments Debated *[Moscow TV]* 60
  Deputies Discuss Various Issues *[Moscow TV]* 61
  Further Issues Debated *[Moscow TV]* 62
  Yeltsin Discusses Interregional Group *[Moscow TV]* 62
  Deputies Debate Interregional Group *[Moscow TV]* 63
Coal Miner Talks, Strikes, Production Viewed 63
  Ryzhkov Meets Donetsk Miners 1 Aug *[TASS]* 63
  Union Chief Meets Donbass Miners *[TRUD 1 Aug]* 64
  Striking Miners' Demands Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jul]* 64
  Kemerovo Official Cites Miners' Demands *[Moscow Radio]* 65
  Ukrainian Official Fails To Satisfy Miners *[PRAVDA 25 Jul]* 66

  Coal Production Outlined *[TASS]* ... 66
  Donbass Strike Situation Detailed *[TRUD 22 Jul]* ... 66
  Karaganda Miners' Strike Reported *[TRUD 22 Jul]* ... 67
  Correspondents Report on Strikes *[TRUD 21 Jul]* ... 68
Railway, Metalworker Strikes Highlighted ... 69
  Strike on Leningrad Rail Line Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 69
  Metalworkers Strike Over Unpaid Wages *[TRUD 26 Jul]* ... 70
Estonian Commission To Study Strike Demands *[TASS]* ... 71
Railway Disruptions Blamed on Armenians *[Baku Radio]* ... 72
People Attack Vehicles on Road to Nagorno-Karabakh *[TASS]* ... 72
Armenian, Azerbaijan Officials Meet 30 Jul *[Baku Radio]* ... 72
'Refugees' Arrested After Abortive Baku March *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 9 Jul]* ... 73
Situation Remains Tense in Abkhaziya as of 31 Jul *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Aug]* ... 73
CPSU Politburo 31 Jul Meeting Summarized *[Moscow TV]* ... 73
Conference Examines Progress in Armenia Rebuilding *[Moscow TV]* ... 75
Latvian Supreme Soviet Discusses Sovereignty *[IZVESTIYA 1 Aug]* ... 75
Estonian Draft Law on Farming Published *[TASS]* ... 76
Lithuanian Komsomol Congress Debates Reported *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 16 Jun]* ... 76
Belorussians Appeal Abroad for Chernobyl Aid *[Moscow Radio]* ... 77
Moldavian Appeal for Ethnic Unity Published *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 23 Jun]* ... 78
U.S. Resolution on Nagorno-Karabakh Condemned *[Baku Radio]* ... 79
Uzbek KGB Official on Fergana Investigation *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 22 Jun]* ... 80
Politburo's Chebrikov Tours Lipetsk Oblast *[PRAVDA 9 Jul]* ... 81
Deputy Elaborates on Gorbachev TV Speech *[PRAVDA 2 Jul]* ... 84
Deputy Views Party, State Apparatus Privileges *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 9 Jul]* ... 86
Spokesman Criticizes Inaccuracies in Swiss Paper *[TASS]* ... 89
Typhoon-Spawned Floods Called 'Unprecedented' *[TASS]* ... 90

Economic

Economic Statistics Show 'Positive Tendencies' *[TASS]* ... 90

Agricultural

Early July Weather, Crop Status Reported *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 15 Jul]* ... 91
  More on Weather, Crop Status *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 25 Jul]* ... 91
Kuban Grain Harvest Progress Reported *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 23 Jul]* ... 92

Scientific

Eight Nuclear Reactors Now Operating in Moscow *[TASS]* ... 92
Work of Research Ship Keldysh Reported *[SOTSIALSTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 20 Jul]* ... 93
Device Created for Detecting AIDS, Cancer *[TASS]* ... 93

Military

Defense Minister Yazov Speaks on Social Issues *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jul]* ... 94
Airborne Troop Commander on Military Doctrine *[TASS]* ... 97
Ligachev, Baklanov Discuss Defense Conversion *[Moscow TV]* ... 98
Deputies' Armed Forces Debate Viewed *[MOSCOW NEWS No 30]* ... 99
Military Prosecutor's Office Discusses Tasks *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jul]* ... 101
Missile Cruiser Inspected by U.S. Officials *[Moscow Radio]* ... 102
USSR Navy Day Celebrated 30 Jul ... 102
  Yazov Issues Order of Day *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Jul]* ... 102
  Admiral on Naval Preparedness *[Moscow International]* ... 103
  Commander Kapitanets Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 103
  Zaykov Attends Ceremony *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Jul]* ... 104
New Mililtary, Fleet Commanders Identified *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Aug]* ... 104
Adm Makarov Discusses Submarine Accidents *[Moscow International]* ... 104
Moiseyev Meets, Answers Questions From Voters *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Aug]* ... 105
Larionov Receives Romanian, Libyan Sailors *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Aug]* ... 105

U.S. Begins Removing INF Missiles From UK Base

LD0108180189 Moscow TASS in English 1538 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] London August 1 TASS— The first 16 U.S. nuclear missiles begin to be withdrawn from the U.S. Air Force Base in Greenham Common, Berkshire County, today. They will be delivered by a cargo transport plane to the United States where they are subject to destruction under the Soviet-U.S. Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty.

The remaining 80 missiles deployed at this military base will be moved from British territory within two years. American missiles are known to have already been withdrawn from the U.S. Air Force Base in Molesworth.

USSR Implementing INF Pact, Destroying Missiles

PM0108103589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Aug 89 First Edition p 2

[Article by Colonel S. Petrenko, chief of the Center for Controlling the Elimination of Shorter-Range Missiles: "Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles in Action"]

[Text] On 1 August 1988, with the explosive demolition of four OTR-22 missiles in the region of Saryozek, the Soviet Union embarked on the practical implementation of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. Even before the treaty entered into force, the missile operating bases on the territory of the GDR and the CSSR had been eliminated—that is, the missiles and the systems' launching, transport, and ground equipment, had been transferred to the sites where they were to be eliminated. The center's specialists—officer V. Leshchenko, V. Ivanov, V. Germanovich, G. Yevdokimov, A. Rogov, I. Chaykovskiy, and others—worked selflessly.

As of now the Soviet side has eliminated 76 percent of the missiles, launchers, and transport facilities of the shorter-range missile systems, and that includes the elimination of all launchers and combat missiles of the OTR-22 complex. The dismantled systems and the mountings and units are being used in the national economy. Petroleum, geological, construction, and power workers have already been presented with over 110 heavy-freight trucks that were used as the chassis for launchers and transport vehicles. Platinum, silver, and gold extracted from the removed missile units and launchers are being surrendered to the state.

I should like to note the atmosphere of trust and efficiency between Soviet and U.S. specialists that formed in the first days of joint work. There have been 29 inspections by U.S. groups at the sites of the elimination of launchers and shorter-range missiles. The inspectors have established their own style of work—a style of precision in fulfilling the treaty terms.

The statements by some U.S. officials who cast doubt on whether the terms of the treaty are really being fulfilled, accusing the Soviet side of attempts to conceal some proportion of the missiles from the U.S. specialists or of eliminating dummies instead of missiles, are surprising, to put it mildly. The distrust displayed by these officials, primarily toward our U.S. colleagues, is simply beyond me. Evidently, the changes in the policy of the Soviet Union and the United States on questions of disarmament, whose first steps were laid by the successful fulfillment of the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, do not suit some people in the West. Nor are they suited by the atmosphere of businesslike cooperation, which is gathering momentum and which could develop into the signing of new treaties and acts aimed at the further deepening of the relaxation of military tension and business, cultural, and friendly ties between the peoples of the USSR and the United States.

General 'Satisfied' With Conventional Arms Talks

AU0108070889 Sofia OTECHESTVEN FRONT in Bulgarian 28 Jul 89 pp 4, 5

[Interview with USSR Major General Viktor Tatarnikov, "leader of the group of USSR experts at the Vienna talks," by Ulyana Prumova, OTECHESTVEN FRONT reporter, in Vienna: "Routes of Hope From the Atlantic to the Urals"; date of interview not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Vienna—The regular round of the Vienna talks ended in mid-July. Let us recall that the talks are divided in two directions: first, the talks of the 33 European states, the United States, and Canada on measures on strengthening confidence and security in Europe; and second, the talks of the 23 on decreasing conventional weapons from the Atlantic to the Urals. On this occasion Maj Gen Viktor Tatarnikov, member of the USSR delegation and leader of the group of Soviet military experts, summarizes the results of the Vienna talks up to now, especially for OTECHESTVEN FRONT readers.

[Prumova] The participants in the talks described the first round as a promising beginning. How do you assess the work of the second round? Was the businesslike, dynamic, and constructive atmosphere noted at the beginning of the talks preserved?

[Tatarnikov] We are satisfied with the results of the session that has ended. The discussions had a lot of substance and intensity and took place in a businesslike manner that was demonstrated by practically all the participants. As a result of this there is a significant degree of agreement and similarity on many basic positions of the countries, and considerable progress was achieved at the talks. How was this specifically expressed?

At the beginning of the round, we noted in general terms that the initial reductions must affect first of all those kinds of weapons that represent a potential for implementing a surprise strike or for conducting large-scale attacking operations. Now we can specifically mention them. These are the six categories of the most destabilizing conventional weapons: airplanes, helicopters, tanks, armored personnel carriers, artillery, and personnel. It must be pointed out that the text of the agreement on the six categories has been incorporated in the preliminary draft of the future document.

At the beginning of the round there was one thing that could be said with certainty about the zone in which the agreement must be applied: The future agreement must encompass the region from the Atlantic to the Urals. Today it is obvious that the two sides find it appropriate to establish other regions within the area of this general region which will have various levels of conventional weapons.

An agreement has been reached on such an important premise as the "Collective Conventional Weapons Limits for Every Alliance." There also is a supplemental agreement on the issue that the limits of both alliances must contain specific levels for the various categories. In addition, limits must be determined for the troops that are located outside the borders of their own national territory. If, during the first round of the Vienna talks, the general outline of the preliminary agreement was worked out, during the second round the outline became more precise and clear, and its structure and contents were determined to a large degree.

The creation of a working structure for the talks undoubtedly was another positive result of the last stage. The working groups have been formed and their activity gradually picks up speed. On certain issues we have even advanced toward joint editing. Thus, much was achieved during the second round. However, we are convinced that more could have been achieved. Let me say frankly: In this context we have a serious complaint against the NATO countries.

[Prumova] There were close and similar elements in the positions of the sides at the talks of the 23. However, there also were differences. The issue of decreasing the tactical air force proved especially difficult. How did the second round help to smooth the differences out?

[Tatarnikov] The tactical air force issue emphatically emerged during the second round. In this area the positions of the two countries were fundamentally different. The Warsaw Pact countries propose to decrease the most dangerous air force category first—the combat strike aircraft—while NATO insisted on reviewing all the ground-based combat air forces, including the antiaircraft defense fighters. We cannot agree to this. In the Warsaw Pact countries the antiaircraft air force is intended to repel the strikes of the strategic air force (air-launched cruise missiles), and the strikes of the Western countries' carrier-based aircraft, which they are excluding from the talks, and which remain a means of inflicting the first strike, as well as a means of intercepting sea-launched cruise missiles.

One could discern inconsistency in the NATO countries' approach, even concerning such categories of conventional weapons as tanks, armored personnel carriers, and artillery, NATO's position on which was determined a long time ago. Thus, in the category of tanks they intend to decrease only a part of the potential, excluding the light tanks from the talks' framework. In the category of armored personnel carriers they exclude an entire subcategory (the heavily armed armored personnel carriers and the combat reconnaissance vehicles). In the category of artillery they are trying to exclude the large-caliber antitank artillery.

This approach by the Western states clearly indicates a striving to leave an open door, through which they could circumvent the future agreement. Naturally, this must not be allowed.

Generally, despite the fact that many obstacles emerged during the second round of talks, I can say that it was a successful round and that the countries received a vast amount of material about a broad range of issues.

[Prumova] Did the picture at the talks of the 35 become clearer and more precise? What factors hinder the talks process? Have the positions on the issues of measures limiting the military activity of the air and naval forces and on incorporating those branches in the agreement become closer?

[Tatarnikov] Yes, undoubtedly the picture at the talks became more precise. This was facilitated by the clarification of the positions of the participating states and the introduction of new working documents which detail the initial proposals. The Bulgarian delegation introduced a particularly important working document on providing preliminary information about military activity of the naval and amphibian forces. Other delegations of the Warsaw Pact member countries introduced documents on informing about naval military activity, limiting the military activity of the ground troops, Air Force, and Navy, and exchanging information about the ground troops, the Air Force, and the Navy.

The delegations of the NATO countries also introduced an expanded document. Many neutral and nonaligned countries also expressed important considerations on various issues of the talks. At the last session of the talks of the 35 they submitted a joint working document which we must carefully analyze. Thus, toward the end of the round, a solid basis of specific work on the new mutually supplementing measures on confidence and security was created.

Unfortunately we do not think that the NATO countries took notice of the concern of the majority of the participants. Their concept about the confidence-building measures suffers as before from bias and inconsistency. While adhering to the openness [otkritost] of the military organization, they are reducing it to openness related to the ground troops and ground-based aviation. They leave the naval forces, a component in which NATO has significant superiority, behind a curtain of secrecy. In practice they are against spreading the confidence-building measures to such dangerous strike components of the participating countries' Armed Forces as the Air Force and the Navy.

The positions of the Warsaw Pact member countries also were confirmed at the Bucharest meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact Member Countries. This is a logical and balanced position. Comparing it with the position of the NATO countries we see that as of now there is no reason to be optimistic. The lack of willingness in many participating states to take into consideration the political realities and the positive changes in Europe in recent years is the main factor that hinders progress at the talks. We hope that during the recess all countries, including NATO, will continue to search for mutually acceptable agreements.

[Prumova] What tasks do you think must be solved first during the next round? Do you think that specific solutions are possible in the near future?

[Tatarnikov] I think that we must begin by comparing the positions of the countries and working out coordinated definitions in the three categories that have been "delayed" not because of the Warsaw Pact—aircraft, helicopters, and personnel. The West also delayed the presentation of its approaches to the rules of calculating all six categories. The working out of coordinated definitions and calculation rules—this is the foundation on which the building of the future agreement will be constructed.

In addition, we must immediately begin to search for solutions to such complex problems as the regional division into zones of reductions, including the stored arsenals of arms in the sublevels set for each zone (for the time being the West disagrees with this), reducing the number of troops of all participating states, and not only of the USSR and the United States, as NATO proposes. Obviously, we will have to continue our work on bringing the countries' positions closer together on the issue of decreasing the air forces. Unfortunately, for the time being there are great differences on this issue. The West proposes to reduce the entire air forces, including its defensive components, i.e., the antiaircraft defense air force. In this manner the most dangerous components—the strike aircraft—are "lost" in the general concept of aircraft. U.S. carrier-based aircraft remain outside the subject of the talks.

At the same time, we must proceed to working out a system of verification over the implementation of the future agreement. This is a very complex and large-scale task, which requires us not only to coordinate the positions of the countries, but also to work out many technical details of the verification.

As far as the possible terms of adopting specific decisions is concerned, I think that the term pointed out by our leaders at he meeting of the Political Consultative Committee—1990—is fully realistic. Naturally, we will have to make efforts if we want to accomplish this, and I mean not only the Warsaw Pact countries.

Negotiator Sees 'Progress' in Chemical Arms Talks

LD0108215889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 2200 GMT on 31 July publishes a 3-minute interview with Sergey Borisovich Batsanov, head of the Soviet delegation at the summer session of the Geneva disarmament talks, by correspondent Vladimir Dimitriyev.

According to Batsanov, the main attention at Geneva was focused on the talks on banning chemical weapons. "On the whole, I think that there can now be talk of progress here—above all, regarding what concerns the Soviet-American consultations being held in parallel with multilateral negotiations and at which the most complex aspects of the future convention are being examined," Batsanov says. At the delegation level, the procedure was agreed on for carrying out inspection on demand. "Such inspections must be obligatory. In other words, the suspected state must not have the right to refuse the inspection," he says.

The preparation of a document on the procedure for destroying chemical weapons stockpiles and production facilities is also almost finished, according to Batsanov.

"Considerable progress has also finally been attained in the elaboration of bilateral confidence-building measures, on the exchange of information on the military chemical potential of the USSR and the United States," he continues. Both sides can "seriously" assist in elaborating a multilateral convention. "Out of the latest positive events, I would single out the attainment in the special committtee on chemical weapons of preliminary agreement on the main provisions for carrying out inspection on demand," Batsanov says; these are "key principles in the organization of such inspections."

Batsanov laments the lack of "acceleration" in the talks on chemical weapons, but they are trying to overcome this, he concludes.

UN Delegate Decries U.S. 'Annexation' of Palau

LD0108214289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1615 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] New York, 1 August. TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reports:

The 56th session of the UN Trusteeship Council, the main part of which was held in May, concluded at UN headquarters today. A report to the Security Council on the results of the session was adopted by four votes (United States, Great Britain, France, and PRC) to one (USSR). The session discussed the situation in the UN trusteeship Pacific Islands territory, which is under U.S. administration.

As USSR representative D.V. Bykov pointed out, the Soviet delegation was obliged to vote against because the report consisted partly of conclusions and recommendations which it could not support. The decisions of the Trusteeship Council, its conclusions and recommendations must be drawn up on a consensus basis and be founded on the relevant provisions of the UN Charter, the trusteeship agreement, and the declaration on decolonization. This did not happen.

The Soviet representative expressed the hope that at the next session the Trusteeship Council will be able to operate with fuller account being taken of the views of all the delegations, and carry out a productive dialogue so decisions can be reached through consensus.

Among the conclusions and recommendations to the Security Council regarding the situation in Micronesia, the Trusteeship Council specifically "welcomes" the agreement foisted by the United States on the commission dealing with future relations between Palau and the United States, and signed in May between these unequal sides. It voiced the hope that "this agreement will help, within a short time, to ensure the conclusion of the process" of formalizing the "free association" between Palau and the United States, through which Washington is endeavoring to conceal its virtual annexation of the atoll.

Rogachev, TV Panel Discuss Asia-Pacific Issues

OW0108055789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0630 GMT 31 Jul 89

["Fresh Winds Over the Pacific Ocean," roundtable devoted to the third anniversary of the Soviet Union's Vladivostok initiatives; moderated by Vladimir Tsvetov, political observer of Soviet Television, with Mikhail Stepanovich Kapitsa, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, director of the Oriental Studies Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and chairman of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity With Asian and African Countries; Igor Alekseyevich Rogachev, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs; Aleksandr Konstantinovich Kislov, doctor of historical sciences and director-organizer of the Peace Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Ivan Dmitriyevich Ivanov, deputy chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission; Major General Yuriy Aleksandrovich Markelov, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Press Center; and Yuriy Mikhaylovich Galenovich, doctor of historical sciences and chief scientific staff member of the Far East Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; date, place of roundtable not given]

[Text] [Program preceded by video montage and accompanying captions indicating that there are 57 countries in the Asia-Pacific Region, with a total of 3 billion people; the Asia-Pacific Region accounts for 60 percent of the world's industrial production and 35 percent of its trade; life expectancy in the region is 50 years; and there are 17 million people in the armed forces of the region.]

[Tsvetov] Hello comrades. Participating in the roundtable are Mikhail Stepanovich Kapitsa, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, director of the Oriental Studies Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and chairman of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity With Asian and African Countries—this is the committee that was the initiator of our roundtable today; Igor Alekseyevich Rogachev, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs; Aleksandr Konstantinovich Kislov, doctor of historical sciences and director-organizer of the Peace Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Ivan Dmitriyevich Ivanov, deputy chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission; Major General Yuriy Aleksandrovich Markelov, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Press Center; and Yuriy Mikhaylovich Galenovich, doctor of historical sciences and chief scientific staff member of the Far East Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The roundtable will be moderated by me, Central Television political observer Vladimir Tsvetov.

Three years ago the Soviet Union proposed a draft plan to include the Asia Pacific Region in the general process of creation of a universal system of international security. This draft plan became known as the Vladivostok initiatives. To a considerable extent the appearance of these initiatives, and to a great extent the essence of these initiatives, was prompted by the Helsinki process, which at the time, in 1986, had already demonstrated its vitality and prospects. Now, as we know, the Asia-Pacific Region is a region differing considerably and maybe even sharply from Europe in terms of the nature of its political, social, and economic problems. And therefore, most governments of Asia-Pacific Region countries did not find an opportunity at the time to agree to the adoption of the European process for the Asia-Pacific Region.

Taking this criticism into account, the Soviet Union last year proposed the seven Krasnoyarsk initiatives, which to a great extent developed into the Vladivostok initiatives, and made them more specific. Now, today, we have gathered here to sum up some of the results. Despite all the differences between the situations in Europe and the Asia-Pacific Region, there is a reality that is identical for both Europe and Asia. This is the reality of the nuclear space age.

[Kapitsa] Why did the question of making this proposal for the Asia-Pacific Region arise? The European experience has shown that it is possible to work fairly fruitfully in the area of detente and strengthening of cooperation between states. There are certain negotiation mechanisms in other continents as well, for example in Africa. There are 50 states in the Asia-Pacific Region and more than 3 billion people, but nothing of the sort exists in Asia. At the same time, there are more problems in Asia than in any other continent. Various problems exist between almost any two countries. These are territorial problems, problems of the division of coastal waters, problems of different historic differences, and religious, national, and other problems.

Since the war, the greatest number of military conflicts have occurred in Asia—there have been 38 major military conflicts. When on 28 July 1986 the Soviet Union came out with its well-known Vladivostok program, four wars were underway in Asia, four big wars, and a fairly serious conflict could have erupted at any time in Korea. Of course, some urgent measures were needed in order to begin a process of detente, of strengthening cooperation in Asia, and of dialogue—as they say today—between the Asian countries, as well as a process of elaboration of some kind of code of behavior for the Asian states that would include both the experience of the United Nations, the experience of the European process, the experience of Bandung, and the experience of the Nonaligned Movement, and finally, the wisdom of the Asian people of the Asian Continent.

The situation in Asia is more complex than the situation in Europe. Yes, we agree. But if it took 8-10 years in Europe to prepare for the Helsinki conference, then in Asia we are prepared to work for 20 years. But the main thing is for work to be undertaken in this direction.

[Tsvetov] You have mentioned a period of 15-20 years. Possibly my optimism has no basis, but I think that now, after the new political thinking has come into action—and the new political thinking is not a list of recipes, the solution of one or another problem, but a methodology for solving problems in the nuclear space age—I think this period of time could be reduced. And I think that those events that have already occurred over the past 3 years, and in particular the military and political detente between the USSR and the United States, have already contributed to a certain shift, and possibly not a small shift, in the development of the situation in the Asia-Pacific Region.

[Kapitsa] Moreover, since extremely great changes have occurred in the past 3 years in Asia and the Pacific Ocean Basin. First, the normalization of almost all regional conflicts has begun. The process is at different levels, but it is underway. Second, the process of decreasing military confrontation is underway, although with more difficulties. The number of missiles is being cut, talks on a reduction of armed forces is going on, and there are various proposal on this issue. And third, during the past 3 years—and I can say this with full responsibility—the relations between all the states of Asia and the Pacific Ocean Basin have improved.

[Markelov] Mikhail Stepanovich has already given an outline of those fundamental changes that are taking place. It should be said that there are, of course, shifts in military detente, in the reduction and lowering of military confrontation, but they are on a global scale. If we look at the regions, then of course the greatest number of shifts have occurred in Europe, in the European region, while the shifts in the Asian region have been insignificant. Mikhail Stepanovich said that the number of nuclear missiles, nuclear weapons, here is being cut. I would like to be more specific and add that, first of all and primarily, the reduction of nuclear missiles and nuclear arms is being done by the Soviet Union, which not only proclaims and proposes initiatives, but reinforces them with practical moves on its part. It shows how words should be followed by actions.

Of course, the improvement in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States has had a significant effect on the relaxation of the situation. This is unequivocal, because these two leading nuclear and maritime powers are the two powers that possess the greatest military potential. How the entire world situation develops, particularly in Asia, depends on whether there is confrontation or cooperation between them. If in the European region we see the greatest positive results stemming from the change in Soviet-U.S. relations, then so far we have nothing to brag about in this regard in Asia.

[Rogachev] I would like to say that all of us have worked intensively during the past 3 years—and it is now exactly 3 years since the 28 July 1986 Vladivostok statement, the Vladivostok speech. These past 3 years have been marked by practically uninterrupted talks, meetings, consultations, exchanges of opinions, and exchanges of visits at all levels, and particularly at the summit level. I believe that on the whole we have succeeded in accumulating a very solid and positive credit over the past 3 years in terms of restructuring our policy in Asia and in the Pacific Ocean region. In this respect I would like to stress that we have managed to improve, and in some cases attain, a fundamental turnabout with regard to the Soviet Union's relations with the countries of Asia and the Pacific Ocean Basin. The Soviet Union has managed to revive and restore its relations with the overwhelming majority, or possibly it would be more accurate to say with all these countries.

Now, if you recall, the Vladivostok speech focused on three levels of problems, three levels of issues. The first was the issue of relations between states. The second concerned regional conflicts. The third level dealt with military detente, an issue that concerned the entire region and, we could say, all countries and states of the world. It could be said without exaggeration that we achieved the greatest success in the first direction. I believe that the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations can be put safely at the first level. We strove for this for a very long time, for many years. This normalization was the result of mutual efforts exerted by both Soviet and Chinese comrades. The pinnacle of this process was the summit meeting in Beijing in the middle of May when Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev met with Chinese leader Deng Xiaoping, and with practically all the top Chinese leaders.

We declared the complete normalization of interstate relations and the restoration of relations between the biggest communist parties of the world—the CPSU and the CPC. If we talk about Soviet-Chinese relations, we already see signs that the summit meeting has given an impetus to a whole series of big steps forward in all directions of Soviet-Chinese cooperation. But this, nevertheless, does not mean that there are no problems between us. We do have problems and difficulties, but we are talking about this freely with one another in a comradely way.

I also want to note the wonderful relations that we have with great India. This was stressed at the Congress of People's Deputies as well. Rajiv Gandhi, the top leader of that country, visited us recently. It is satisfying to say that meetings between Soviet and Indian leaders already have become a tradition and something inalienable in our cooperation. I would say that these meetings are not bound by protocol. Each meeting raises our cooperation to a new level and adds new quality to Soviet-Indian relations. This also could be said about the latest meeting.

I would like to emphasize that at the present time we are observing things in this part of the world, such as the normalization of regional conflicts, that no one could imagine 3 years ago. We could only dream about such developments before. We all are witnesses to the honorable way in which the Soviet Union is fulfilling the Geneva accords on Afghanistan. We withdrew our troops. It is not our fault that a fratricidal war is continuing there. Unfortunately, both Pakistan and the United States are most directly connected with the fact that no end to it is yet in sight. But the fact remains that the process of eliminating this regional conflict has begun.

Another development is the convening of the international conference on Cambodia, which has begun in Paris. We had no idea 3 years ago when the start of such a conference could be mentioned. Of course, many difficulties still exist that must be dealt with and overcome, and a long path must be traversed before a comprehensive political settlement in this subregion can be worked out. However, a start has been made. Approximately 20 countries, as well as the UN secretary general, have gathered in Paris to discuss the external and internal aspects of this old regional problem.

[Tsvetov] Vietnam is withdrawing its troops by 30 September, right? [Rogachev nods his assent] This announcement was followed by two rounds of very productive talks in Indonesia. Finally, Cambodia adopted a status of permanent neutrality. Apparently all of this played a constructive role in establishing a basis for the Paris conference.

[Unidentified voice off-screen] Plus direct contacts between China and Vietnam began.

[Tsvetov] Yes, that is very important.

[Rogachev] That is correct. By the way, these are all elements of our Vladivostok program. These are our recommendations and our advice, and they have now begun to be implemented. Of course, the forthcoming conference on Cambodia cannot be attributed to any one side. This conference is the result of collective efforts—primarily, I would say, of the three Indochina countries and the ASEAN countries, countries of the region that are extremely interested in living in friendship, peace, and concord. As a matter of fact, the prospects for establishing a zone of peace, freedom, neutrality, cooperation, and stability in Southeast Asia are becoming increasingly more visible now, to be followed, at the highest level, so to speak, by the establishment of a nuclear-free zone. The concept of such a zone was proposed by the ASEAN countries.

[Tsvetov] On the other hand, we also should note that we should also be prepared for the possibility that the Paris conference may not achieve all the results that we may desire.

[Rogachev] You are correct to point out that we should approach everything in a sober and realistic way. It is my personal opinion that the success of this conference depends to a great extent on whether the Khmer factions themselves manage, and how well they manage, to work out joint agreements, and primarily between Hun Sen, head of the Cambodian Government, and Prince Norodom Sihanouk.

[Galenovich] I would like to return to the point you raised intitially—namely, how is the United States behaving in this situation. It was an unprecedented situation both in the history of the United States and in the history of the region when U.S. President Bush visited this very region, the Asia-Pacific Region, and particularly China just 34 days after he took office. In the history of the United States, American presidents always have first visited their friends across the Atlantic Ocean in Europe. This time the U.S. President crossed the Pacific Ocean.

Now, this was not a coincidence. I believe it is related to the great positive changes that are taking place in the region, both in Soviet-Chinese relations, first of all, and in the relations between all the four major countries of this region—the Soviet Union, the United States, China, and Japan. An extremely important development is what I will refer to as the geometrical change that has taken place vis-a-vis the regional situation. If we sometimes said in the past that there was a triangle, we now must refer to the rectangle in which the United States must find its new place. If it does not intensify its dialogue with each side of this rectangle, it apparently will not be able to play the same very active role that it has played previously, even though it plans to continue to play it.

[Kislov] May I say something.

[Tsvetov] Of course.

[Kislov] I believe, nevertheless, that when we speak about the Asia-Pacific Region we can hardly even talk about a rectangle. This is such an extensive region, there are so many different interests among its many countries, that to reduce it to four, or even five or six countries, would be a simplification of the situation and a desire to represent the real situation in some schematic way.

For example, can we ignore Australia's position on many issues? Although it is an ally of the United States, it far from always follows the American lead. Australia has its own special position on many problems relating to Japan, and primarily on a certain—I am not saying a very rapid, but a certain remilitarization, nevertheless—growth in the attention being paid in Japan to the establishment of its so-called Self Defense Forces and an expansion of their functions. Now take the position of New Zealand, which, according to some information, already is preparing to almost officially raise the question of withdrawing from ANZUS [the Australia, New Zealand, U.S. Treaty Organization]. Will this not change the political picture of the region? New Zealand is a relatively small country, but it has enormous ties with dozens of states in the South Pacific Ocean where it plays a very serious role and exerts a very big influence.

That is why I think that when we talk about this region we must take into consideration a whole series of factors that previously, 3 years ago, we could disregard. Herein lies the complexity of the situation and the complexity of analyzing the situation. But at the same time, this shows how quickly completely new processes are developing in the region.

In connection with this I would like to return to the forecast of 15-20 years. Yes, if we approach matters with a yardstick that is 3 years old, then possibly 15-20 years is right. But the development of the situation is accelerating so rapidly that we can now talk—and this is my opinion and I am convinced of this—about a much tighter schedule.

[Tsvetov] Ivan Dmitriyevich, I recall that in his Vladivostok speech Mikhail Sergeyevich [Gorbachev] spoke for the first time about the creation of joint enterprise zones in the Far East. If after 3 years we can ascertain certain progress in the solution of all other problems that Mikhail Sergeyevich mentioned in Vladivostok, we cannot yet see, however, any obvious or noticeable progress in the question of creating joint enterprise zones. What is the reason for this?

[Ivanov] I would like to expand this question somewhat, because joint enterprise zones are just one form of foreign economic ties. In the past 3 years the aspect of our foreign economic ties in the region has also changed. We have many more partners. Our previously sporadic trade relations with a number of countries, such as Australia, the Philippines, and Thailand, have become permanent. Relations on a nongovernmental level have been established with South Korea and business circles in Hong Kong and Macao. There are practically no countries remaining in which we do not have some form of economic activity. Border trade has extended over the entire perimeter of the Soviet-Chinese border, over its entire length. Besides trade we are now entering into more complex forms of economic relations, investment relations, and so forth.

Besides, not only separate corporations are becoming our partners in this region, but entire consortiums as well. For example, a week ago we convened a meeting of deputy chairmen of oblispolkoms and krayispolkoms [oblast and kray soviet executive committees] of the Far East to acquaint them with an American consortium and a South Korean consortium that came to the Soviet Union with specific business proposals. So the picture is broader and goes beyond these zones.

As far as the Japanese are concerned, I would say the following. They are missing the moment when the situation here is changing fundamentally, and we can reselect our partners in the Far East. Overconcentration of our trade with any one country and its narrow (?interests) no longer exists. We can choose. It is time for the Japanese to somehow understand this.

[Rogachev] I would like to add to what the comrades said. I think that generally the period of stagnation in relations with Japan is fading into the past. Various signs of a considerable enlivening of interest of both official and business circles in Japan have appeared and I do not see any kind of death grip or link between the so-called territorial issue and the problem of improving the overall complex of Soviet-Japanese relations. If this is so, it opens broad prospects for further development of cooperation with the Japanese.

Now I would like to add that Japan presently occupies third place among our trading partners in the capitalist countries by volume of trade turnover. Of course, this is far from what we would like to have in our trade with Japan. The opportunities here are inexhaustible, absolutely inexhaustible.

[Tsvetov] We have mentioned expansion of trade and economic relations with South Korea, but the other socialist countries are also actively participating in this process, and some socialist countries have even gone further than we have in this question, the question of establishing contacts and ties with South Korea. It seems to me that this process, the process of establishing contacts between socialist countries and South Korea, has also played a very important role in changing the general situation in the Asia-Pacific Region. Moreover, I think this process stimulated an enlivening of ties between the DPRK and South Korea.

[Rogachev] It is what we are striving for. After all, in his Vladivostok speech, Mikhail Sergeyevich said that we favor trade and economic ties with South Korea within the context of a general normalization of the situation on the Korean peninsula. We did indeed proceed with the establishment of direct ties with South Korea...

[Tsvetov interrupts] Direct economic ties.

[Rogachev] Economic and trade, on a nongovernmental basis, strictly on a nongovernmental basis. We opened an office of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in the Asia-Pacific Regioni this year, and in July, just the other day, a corresponding South Korean office opened in Moscow. Last year our trade reached $200 million, if I am not mistaken, and this is not much. This year it will grow. But I want to add that our neighbor the PRC, which adheres to the same rules in relation to South Korea—that is, it maintains ties on a commercial basis—had a volume of trade with South Korea last year amounting to about $3 billion.

As far as ties of other socialist countries are concerned, then naturally it is the sovereign right of every one of them to determine the nature and format of their relations with South Korea. As far as we are concerned, we have alliance relations with the DPRK, and have certain responsibilities regarding this country, and we proceed from this. We very much hope that our actions in regard to South Korea will propel the North and South toward broader dialogue, a deepening of this dialogue, and the eventual solution of the Korean problem on a mutually acceptable basis.

[Tsvetov] Now regarding this basis, it is extremely divergent, because as we know the DPRK proposes holding military-political talks at a high level, as well as talks between the DPRK, South Korea, and the United States. The DPRK also proposes turning the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone and the eventual establishment of a federation of the two Koreas.

[Rogachev interrupts] A confederation.

[Tsvetov] Yes, a confederation. South Korea proposes a gradual process, a movement from nonpolitical contacts to political ones, beginning at a low level, gradually increasing it more and more. Probably this kind of gradual movement from the bottom upward, without rushing [pedalirovat] this movement, will possibly lead to a positive result. And this may require those 20 years.

[Rogachev] It seems to me that one of the main problems that requires eventual solution on the Korean peninsula is the presence of American troops—some 40,000-odd servicemen—and the presence of nuclear weapons, the presence of Lance missiles. All of this is found in the most direct proximity to Soviet borders. That is why we cannot remain complacent and dispassionately observe this powerful nuclear potential so close to our territory. Therefore, we understand full well the proposals being made by the DPRK leadership, aimed at eliminating the foreign military presence in South Korea. This could be considered to be the root of tension.

[Kapitsa] The proposal of our Korean friends to reduce the armed forces of the North and South to 100,000 men on both sides is also quite reasonable.

[Rogachev] Quite right.

[Kapitsa] I have had contacts with South Korean representatives, both official and unofficial, and have said: Why don't you try the North Koreans? Begin talks. What if suddenly it will become possible to reduce armed forces to 200,000 men on the Korean peninsula? This is the key to all the problems. But the South Koreans do not want to do this.

[Tsvetov] You know that a result of this kind would be too good to believe. [laughs] But I do think that we should strive for this, and probably if this were achieved then it would become possible in the Asia-Pacific Region to raise the question of the principle of building nonprovocative defenses. We have the term sufficient defense, and in Europe it is being broadly debated and discussed and gradually being implemented, right? Well maybe in the Asia-Pacific Region this principle of nonprovocative defense would be decisive, or at least it would be very important.

[Markelov] The term nonprovocative defense is a term that was coined in the West. We understand this term to mean that the sides will not have the potential to undertake a surprise attack and will not have the opportunity to initiate large-scale military operations. Unfortunately the sides—and I do not mean only the Soviet Union, but our partners as well—view this differently. The Soviet Union considers it essential to decrease the level of military confrontation, to reduce and decrease the military potential, which it is doing in practice. In the framework of the unilaterally announced reduction of Soviet armed forces by 500,000 men, the Soviet group of forces in the Far East will be decreased by 200,000 men. In other words, we are implementing a change to a strictly defensive doctrine with deeds, not just words. That is, precisely to a nonprovocative defense. We are striving to see that our military potential corresponds with the demands of reasonable sufficiency and is only for defense.

Unfortunately, the United States is not supporting our proposal and is not following our deeds, our steps. And it stubbornly refuses to even hear, far less do anything about a reduction of its forces deployed in the Pacific Ocean zone.

[Tsvetov] Now, in relation to the U.S. presence in this area, notwithstanding the fact that the ASEAN countries and the countries that are not members of this group are presently actively increasing their armed forces to a known extent, could it not turn out, however, that if the U.S. military presence in this region disappears, then such countries as Japan, Indonesia, and so forth will have a stimulus or reason for increasing their armed forces even more rapidly? Could this lead to a kind of regional arms race?

[Markelov] I think there are no grounds for such fears, because more can be achieved by political means than by military ones. And if some country, under conditions of general disarmament and conditions of a general reduction of military potential, begins to increase its armed forces, then I think this would give rise to a universal negative reaction.

[Tsvetov] I am just looking at this from a worldly point of view...

[Markelov interrupts] I understand.

[Tsvetov] It is easier for two participants in a negotiation to come to agreement than it would be for dozens to agree over a single problem.

[Markelov] You know, I would not put it that way. Presently more than a dozen states are reaching agreement in Europe. Besides, they have begun agreeing successfully, I think, about a reduction of conventional armed forces and arms. I have NATO and the Warsaw Pact in mind.

[Galenovich] I would like to say that the situation in this region differs from that in Europe also because the people in the region have a different historic memory. It is extremely important that the people of the Asia-Pacific Region, the people of the Far East, had a very good knowledge of what the desire of one power for superiority in this region means. They cannot forget the aggression and military activities of Japan in this region; they cannot forget the theory that existed at the time when they wanted to unite all eight corners under one roof. And this historic memory, which very stubbornly persists in the consciousness of all the people in this region, is a very serious restraining factor for anyone to attempt to again foist his superiority in this region of the world, now or in the future.

[Tsvetov] Let us return to economic aspects of the changes in the situation in the Asia-Pacific Region. I would like to recall that about 60 percent of the world's industrial production is accounted for by this region, as well as 34 percent of the world's trade.

[Ivanov] If we talk about foreign economic relations, and much is being said about them today, one should understand one simple thing: A country's foreign economic ties cannot be healthier or more efficient than the economy of the country on which it is based. Unfortunately, this base remains rather weak in the Far East. Even implementation of those proposals that were made in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk has not fundamentally changed the situation there, as far as the rate of economic and social development is concerned.

After Vladivostok, a Program for the Accelerated Development of the Productive Forces of the region was adopted. Besides, this program added Chita Oblast and the Buryat ASSR, but presently this program is not being implemented due to a lack of the necessary capital investments and material supplies.

We are more and more convinced that a completely special mechanism of foreign economic relations must be established there. The region is remote and many problems—that even in Siberia and the European part are solved by us at the expense of national resources—will have to be solved there to a great extent at the expense of foreign economic resources.

With regard to zones, presently there is a decision, or rather instruction, to establish a zone in the area of Nakhodka City. There is a lot of local enthusiasm, but this enthusiasm has not yet been reinforced with detailed technical and economic foundations.

As we understand it, a zone is not some kind of a territorially restricted heaven, but an instrument of regional development. What will the region get from the operations of this zone? Moreover, we have told everyone from the very beginning, and we are all agreed on this, that this will not be a zone based on the Chinese model, not small enclaves working for export. This zone must, while partially retaining an export orientation, work for Soviet territory, operate for the domestic market in two capacities, as a supplier of goods and technology to the domestic market and as a school for the market economy, both for local and union-level personnel. So apparently we are talking about the drawing up of a major decision on the establishment of a special foreign economic regime for the Far East region and adjacent oblasts. Then the region will really be able to join the processes in the Asia-Pacific Region, (?take on) part of our open economy, and develop, as we have noted, in interdependence with the rest of the world.

[Tsvetov] Ivan Dmitriyevich, we once discussed this topic with you on the "Repercussions" television program. Later we received an enormous number of letters in which the majority of television viewers with sufficient impartiality, and some even quite sharply, expressed their opinions on joint enterprise zones. And the main reason was as follows: Previously the natural resources of the Far East were plundered by central departments, and now they would be plundered by the Japanese, Koreans, and Chinese. I would like you to somehow pacify our television viewers, because I know this will not happen.

[Ivanov] I know about the letters; we get them too. This topic was also raised during discussions in the Supreme Soviet, although maybe not as sharply. I suppose a distinct or sufficiently detailed explanation has not yet been given to comrades as to what specifically is intended. We are not talking about cutting off a piece of the territory and creating a concession on it and ending Soviet power there. That is not so. Soviet legislation with amendments only to social and economic laws will be in effect on the territories of these zones. Besides, their area will be relatively small compared to the expanses of the Far East. It will remain Soviet territory. Moreover these zones will not resemble some kind of a pit from which raw materials will be exported. The Nakhodka zone is being planned as a zone for the comprehensive processing of the raw materials produced by the Far East. This includes timber, metals, and fish. That is what it will look like at the first stage of its development. The power of local Soviets will be retained there. As a matter of fact, we have in mind that not a single zone will be developed without the concurrence of local organs of power and the local population, and this envisages possible referendums.

[Galenovich] It seems to me that glasnost is very important here. It is very important to be at the level of public consciousness that has arisen and which we can see. We are taking part in this ourselves. What do I have in mind? First of all, not a single question on the Soviet Union's border with any country of the region should by any means be solved without taking into cosideration the interests of the native population and the population that lives in these regions. They must themselves decide the question about what to do with their natural resources. No one should solve this on their behalf. This is not the way it was in the past. Economic estimates must be drawn up and made public, so that the population is convinced by the economic calculations and not by some plans that have not been substantiated in this way.

[Kislov] I want to raise another issue, to take a look at the other side of the coin, if you will. After all, it is not necessary for these joint enterprises to be organized only on Soviet territory. This is a very important issue. Why not organize some kind of joint enterprises in Vietnam, for example, primarily to supply Far East fruit?

[Tsvetov] You may recall that in Vladivostok, Mikhail Sergeyevich proposed to block the path of proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Asia-Pacific Region. Later in Krasnoyarsk this was made more specific. In Krasnoyarsk it was noted that the USSR pledged not to increase its nuclear arms in the Asia-Pacific Region and appealed for its example to be followed. We know that in this region a treaty on the establishment of a nuclear-free zone has been concluded in the southern part of the Pacific Ocean. We know about proposals to create such zones in the Korean peninsula and Southeast Asia. We spoke about this. New Zealand has antinuclear laws, about which you have spoken. And there is India's proposal that Igor Alekseyevich mentioned, which is to create a world free of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union has also proposed consultations on the concept of a nuclear-free zone in Southeast Asia. In other words, it supported the initiative proposed by the ASEAN countries.

[Rogachev] The fact of the matter is that in the Asian part of the country we are destroying 436 intermediate- and shorter-range missiles in accordance with the Soviet-U.S INF Treaty. And as far as I know, we are fulfilling our obligations scrupulously. The missiles are being destroyed in strict accordance with the schedule, and of course this will be a major step in order to decrease nuclear potentials in Asia and the Far East. But I think this is only the beginning of the process that we must complete.

[Tsvetov] At the beginning of our roundtable we said that the winds of Helsinki have reached the Pacific Ocean and have spawned serious changes in the international situation there. I think our discussion has confirmed this idea, and we must hope that the Helsinki winds, as they get stronger, will have an even greater influence on the Asia-Pacific Region.

[Kapitsa] And that the talks on strengthening peace and security in the Asia-Pacific Region will be gradually elevated to a government level.

[Tsvetov] Well, I would like to thank the participants in our roundtable, and I hope we will have another meeting.

[Kapitsa] With pleasure.

Observers Discuss Cambodia, NATO, Afghanistan

LD3007195489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 30 Jul 89

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Yuriy Emmanuilovich Kornilov, TASS political observer; Nikolay Agayants; and Vadim Borisovich Kassis, editor-in-chief of GOLOS RODINY and OTCHIZNA]

[Text] [Agayants] Hello, esteemed comrade listeners. Our guests in the studio today are well-known international affairs journalists: Yuriy Emmanuilovich Kornilov, TASS political observer; and Vadim Borisovich Kassis, editor-in-chief of GOLOS RODINY and OTCHIZNA.

Summer is at its height; but in spite of that, in spite of the fact that the period of vacations and parliamentary recesses has begun, in spite of the record heat wave almost everywhere, the world's political life is not standing still, as the events of the past week confirm. Judge for yourselves: The unexpected aggravation of the situation in Japan following the defeat of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party at the recent elections; the 10th anniversary of the victory of the Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua, which the people welcomed in a complex and tense situation; the Iranian presidential election; the conference on Cambodia; various meetings and talks—in a word, much that is interesting and important, has been going on in the world. But as we know, you cannot encompass the unencompassable, so we will try to pick out the main points from this kaleidoscopic flux of events and phenomena of international life.

For example, the mass media in the fraternal socialist countries—and not of them alone—have been giving much attention to the meetings that took place at the Kremlin between Comrade Gorbachev and Hungarian Socialist Workers Party Chairman Nyers and General Secretary [title as heard] Grosz, as well as with Batmonh, general secretary of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] and chairman of the presidium of the People's Great Hural of Mongolia, which took place in an atmosphere of full mutual understanding and comradeship.

[Kornilov] There is, of course, nothing fortuitous about the attention that has been paid to those meetings. In the present situation, in the conditions created by the deep processes of perestroyka and renewal occurring in our countries, such meetings are necessary both for the fruitful exchange of experience and for the adjustment of interaction in the economic sphere.

[Kassis] But also, surely, for working out a common policy in international affairs, in the spirit of the new political thinking which, though not as rapidly as we would like, is continuing to establish itself in relations among countries with different political and social systems.

[Agayants] Yes. At the meeting with the Hungarian leaders on 25 July, both Comrade Gorbachev and Comrades Nyers and Grosz underlined the irreplaceable importance of mutually beneficial cooperation for the development of our countries, noting that overcoming problems that exist here is linked with the restructuring of the economic mechanism by means of a broadening of the commodity and monetary basis of economic ties and stronger cooperation in industry and science.

[Kornilov] As far as the current international situation is concerned, the participants in the talks were unanimous in their assessment of it—in their assessment of the ways to bring out the potentialities inherent in it in the interests of consolidating peace and security, developing mutually useful cooperation in Europe, and indeed on the scale of the entire globe.

[Kassis] Also of importance, in my view, is one aspect touched on during the talks: the question of the continued presence of Soviet troops in Hungary. It was agreed to take new steps in reducing them in accordance with the disarmament processes in Europe and with progress at the Vienna talks.

[Agayants] Of significance in this regard is Comrade Gorbachev's meeting with Comrade Batmonh, during which the sides exchanged information and views on the vital problems of Soviet-Mongolian cooperation and the international situation. Here, too, the participants noted that the fundamental community of approaches of the CPSU and the MPRP to socialist renewal broadens the possibilities and prospects for improving mutually advantageous cooperation, which relies on the foundations of the traditional friendship of the Soviet and Mongolian peoples, and on the principles of equality of rights and mutual respect.

[Kornilov] At the same time, it was stressed that we must eliminate, jointly and vigorously, everything that still prevents us from achieving the maximum return and results. Comrades Gorbachev and Batmonh agreed that the party bodies and ideological and other institutions of our country and Mongolia could implement more vigorously and with greater benefit the long-term program for strengthening cooperation between the CPSU and the MPRP in the areas of ideology, culture, science, and education. There should, they noted, be fuller utilization of the available possibilities and more rapid response to the needs of life. A serious and very important observation, for we make many good and sensible decisions, but the way in which they are executed is often still not up to the mark.

[Kassis] The discussion of international affairs during the meeting between Comrades Gorbachev and Batmonh has confirmed the unity in the approaches of our two countries to assessing the political situation currently prevailing in the world. The Mongolian leader stated the Mongolian People's Republic support for the principled ideas and provisions set out in the documents of the Bucharest conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the member states of the Warsaw Treaty. He also noted the important stabilizing significance of the Soviet-Chinese summit talks, which were held in Beijing in May, for the development of the situation in Asia. The strengthening of stability and good-neighborliness and of mutually advantageous cooperation in this extensive region fully meets the interests and aspirations of Mongolia. This is what Comrade Batmonh said.

[Agayants] We should remind our radio listeners that during his meeting with the Mongolian leader, Mikhail Sergeyevich welcomed the creative contribution of the

Republic to the expansion of the bilateral and multilateral political and public dialogue in Asia, and to the assertion of the principles of nonaggression in relations between the states of Asia and the Pacific. These steps, movements, are already yielding positive results; I have in mind, in particular, the international conference on Cambodia underway in Paris, where Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze has arrived to take part.

[Kornilov] By the way, Nikolay Ivanovich, quite recently it still seemed that a deadlock situation had taken shape around this problem, so great were the differences between the Cambodian chairman of the Council of Ministers and foreign minister—that is what it is once again customary to call it, instead of Kampuchea—and the leaders of the three opposition groups. Some observers even noted that it is impossible to achieve a compromise, and that the planned international conference will not yield anything.

[Kassis] The situation, it seemed, was aggravated to the extreme when Prince Norodom Sihanouk said: There is total disagreement; the situation is worse today than yesterday. But thanks to the active position of France, which, I remind you, is co-chairing the conference, it has nevertheless proved possible to arrange the dialogue.

[Agayants] I think we ought to specify here that the differences touch on a whole range of Cambodian problems, from procedural ones—that is, who will take part in the conference—right up to the future of the country.

[Kornilov] I think a great deal will depend, Nikolay Ivanovich, on the goodwill of the Khmer sides, on an understanding on their part of their responsibility for the destiny of the homeland. If this is forthcoming, then any problems, however complex and tangled they may be, can be solved. In an interview with our [news] agency prior to his departure for Paris, Comrade Shevardnadze said, and I quote: Of course, the best option would be an accord on the whole package of problems connected with a Cambodian settlement in one meeting. At a minimum, Eduard Amvrosiyevich stressed, the conference in Paris should place Cambodia firmly on the road of a political settlement.

[Kassis] Yes, the international conference must expedite to a maximum degree the process of solving problems in order to stop the conflict, which has continued for many long years and is exerting a destabilizing influence on all of Southeast Asia.

[Agayants] Well, we will hope that the conference will manage to fulfill its difficult mission successfully, and thereby remove one of the chronic irritants in international affairs to the benefit of peace and cooperation. Let us go on to another subject. A notable event in the past week, which has attracted the attention of the British public—and not only the British—was the official visit to Great Britain by the USSR defense minister.

[Kornilov] In receiving the Soviet minister, British Prime Minister Thatcher spoke in terms of this visit testifying to the aspiration of both countries to establish trust and mutual understanding. I think this is an accurate assessment. Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov's visit has indeed become an important and most positive event in the development of relations between London and Moscow. One can agree with the statement by the British newspaper DAILY TELEGRAPH, which asserts that the visit will promote a better knowledge and understanding of one another.

One can also agree with a statement by another British newspaper, THE TIMES, which expresses the hope that the visit will make it possible to place contacts between soldiers of the two countries on a regular footing.

[Kassis] If we are to speak of the reaction to this visit in Britain, I would single out, perhaps, a further factor. Many in the mass media noted that the visit, the first in the history of Soviet-British relations, is an unusual one, even to a certain extent a sensational one. A correspondent of the ITV [Independent Television Network] television company, for example, in a report from onboard the aircraft carrier "Invincible," which the Soviet guest visited, stated that just a year ago British naval personnel cold not have imagined seeing a Soviet general boarding this state-of-the-art British warship.

[Kornilov] Well, Vadim Borisovich, a year or two ago—that is not mentioning an earlier period—we could not have imagined many things. Could we, for example, have predicted that a time would come when the USSR Armed Forces chief of the General Staff would visit U.S. Army units and military installations and when U.S. Admiral Crowe, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces, would be the guest of our Armed Forces and we would see go on board the most modern, and quite recently ultrasecret, Soviet bomber? And was it really easy to imagine not so long ago that a Soviet marshal would be welcomed with an ovation under the Capitol dome and that Soviet sailors would be guests at a U.S. Navy base? But this has all happened, just the same. Incidentally, Marshal Akhromeyev, adviser to the chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Committee on Defense and State Security, spoke quite recently—just last week—and told the U.S. Congress about Soviet foreign policy and was then received by Preisdent Bush who, incidentally, reacted most approvingly to the contacts of the two countries in the military sphere. And the Soviet missile cruiser "Marshal Ustinov" and other naval ships of ours visited the Norfolk naval base in Virginia, and were received there most warmly. As far as I know, a detachment of U.S. ships will, incidentally in a few days, pay a return visit to our shores and we will welcome U.S. sailors in Sevastopol.

[Agayants] Yes, times are definitely changing. The hand of the political barometer is moving further and further away from the "cloudy" reading, a fact that is giving an opportunity to expand and strengthen the constructive and broad political dialogue that is proceeding between the East and West. I think that the British and other mass media organs are correct in noting, when commenting on the visit of our defense minister to the banks of the Thames, that today military leaders and representatives of military circles are playing a more and more vigorous and noticeable role in the dialogue alongside the political figures, parliamentarians, scientists, and representatives of the public. And this is precisely a strengthening of the dialogue.

[Kornilov] I agree with you, Nikolay Ivanovich. It is appropriate, I think, to recall that recently—in June—Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, in receiving U.S. Admiral Crowe, particularly stressed the importance of systematic contacts between the military leaders of the two countries, having indicated that this makes no small contribution to improving Soviet-U.S. relations. This is the way things actually work out. And this applies not only to the United States. An open and frank dialogue between military people, as well as a dialogue between political figures, gives an opportunity to compare and correlate various concepts and positions on the fundamental problems of our times, problems connected, first and foremost, with disarmament and with guaranteeing the security of states, which means understanding better the position of each other.

[Kassis] Well then, our country—representatives of the Soviet Army—has something to say on this account. As Defense Minister Yazov stressed when speaking at a news conference in London, the Soviet Union is aspiring to a non-nuclear future, and if confrontation remains, then it is necessary for it to be at the lowest level possible, because even conventional war today, not to mention nuclear war, would be a catastrophe for the whole world.

[Kornilov] Here one must bear in mind, of course, that the positions of our country and the NATO countries differ on a range of issues, and differ substantially, and that during dialogue not only spheres of agreement are defined, but also spheres of contradictions, of differences and of different attitudes.

It is well known, for example, that our country, proceeding from the basic principle that the security of states must be guaranteed primarily by political means, and this thesis was stressed once more recently, with full vigor, at the USSR Congress of People's Deputies... So then, proceeding from this basic principle, our country is unilaterally reducing the number of its Armed Forces and weapons and its military budget. Just last Thursday—27 July—the USSR Supreme Soviet session adopted a decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet on reduction in the USSR Armed Forces and in expenditures on defense in 1989-90. And another thing is also known: Washington is not demonstrating, at least has not been demonstrating up to now, an intention to respond with similar measures to these positive steps.

[Agayants] This was confirmed once again, Yuriy Emmanuilovich, during the discussion in the U.S. Congress of the U.S. military budget for fiscal year 1990, which begins, as we know, on 1 October.

[Kornilov] Precisely so, Nikolay Ivanovich. The administration—the U.S. Administration—is stubbornly aspiring to get immense allocations for military purposes through Congress—over $305 billion. And a considerable sum—almost $5 billion—is envisioned for star wars research, although the House of Representatives is advocating reducing those expenditures by one- third. Attempting to justify their ambitions in space, the propagandists at the Pentagon are rushing from one extreme to the other. At one moment they call SDI a shield designed to guarantee the defense of the United States from some kind of unknown enemy, and at another moment they call it a limited system allegedly designed merely to avert accidental attack. One way or another, the Star Wars program, which representative Barbara Boxer has described as a chemeleon program, remains, as they say, politically afloat. And the question arises: How is one to tie in the immense expenditures on SDI, on the one hand, with the assurances of the administration about its desire to advance the cause of reduction in strategic offensive weapons, on the other hand?

[Kassis] It is reported that Marshal Akhromeyev spoke about this problem quite sharply when he addressed the U.S. Congress.

[Kornilov] Yes, Vadim Borisovich, that is correct. I also read such reports by the U.S. news agencies. Well, that is a component part in the dialogue, in the discussion, and an extremely important and necessary part. We have told and will continue to tell our partners in the talks that we clearly see not only a lack of coincidence in positions where that exists, but that we also see how and where the words of the partner and his assurances differ from actions and from policy implemented in practice.

[Kassis] We have talked about allocations for implementing the so-called SDI. But does the administration's program to build 132 B-2 Stealth bombers at a cost of $70 billion not catch one's attention, a program which the same Barbara Boxer describes as a threat to arms control? The implementation of that program, which certain circles in the United States advocate just as assiduously, would mean a dangerous step toward the creation of a material base for strategic instability.

[Kornilov] Correct. And we are also speaking directly and openly about this. At the 27 July briefing at the USSR Foreign Ministry's Press Center in Moscow, it was stressed in this connection, among other things, that our country has adhered to and adheres to a strategy of defense sufficiency, with no room for a first strike.

[Agayants] Nevertheless, returning to the evaluations, judgments, and opinions which the foreign press is currently giving for the outcome of the visit to Britain of our defense minister and of the stay in the United States of Marshal Akhromeyev, one should, I think, note and stress the main thing: No matter how sharp the East-West dialogue may be, it is important and noteworthy that this dialogue—in which, I repeat, military figures are also taking a more and more frequent and vigorous part—should proceed, develop, acquire greater content, and become stronger. And this undoubtedly promotes not just the erosion of the enemy image, but allows one to understand better and ascertain mutual views and positions and, consequently, expand the base of mutual understanding and strengthen the potential for trust.

[Kassis] Let us look at one more extremely important aspect of international life. In connection with the conference on Cambodia, USSR Foreign Minister Shevardnadze answered, as we have already noted above, a number of questions posed by a TASS diplomatic correspondent. And this is what is characteristic: He emphasized that in political terms it is vital to pursue the settlement of regional conflicts, a possibility opened up by the agreements on Afghanistan.

[Agayants] That is, of course, so, Vadim Borisovich. Regrettably, not all the participants who signed the Geneva package on Afghanistan are approaching with due responsibility an end to the bloodshed there. Washington is, in effect, encouraging Islamabad to continue a war that has been underway for over 10 years now. In that period more than 1 million people have died in a country with a population of almost 18 million. It is still difficult to name a precise figure for the number of deaths among the population of the Republic. After all, a census of the inhabitants has not been taken. It is officially considered in Kabul that about 10 percent of those who died in that period were government troops.

[Kornilov] It is also very difficult to give a figure for the dead among the irreconcilable opposition. This can be explained, if only by the fact that a large number of mujahidin die in intertribal clashes. Take just the most recent incident thath took place in Takhar Province. Thirty members of the gangs and formations, which are part of the so-called Islamic Society of Afghanistan headed by Rabbani, were killed. Rabbani asserts that the killing of his people was committed by militants from the most radical group of the Islamic Party of Afghanistan, of which Hikmatyar is the ringleader. But that group rejects the acusations against it.

[Kassis] Incidentally, this crisis that has arisen between the two leading groups of the Peshawar alliance has led to a great deal of concerned talks in Washington. Even the State Department has been obliged to issue a special statement sharply condemning those who killed the mujahidin members. At the same time, the war causes victims, first and foremost among the civilian population. In Kabul, for example, hundreds of children, women, and old people have already died in the past 6 months. Inhabitants of Jalalabad, Khowst, and Qandahar are being killed in missile shelling day and night. Immense damage has been done to the country's economy. More than 1,000 installations and enterprises have been destroyed, and 350 bridges and 3,000 km of roads wrecked. There have been 5,000 transport units taken out of action and 2,000 schools, 140 hospitals, and dozens of mosques destroyed.

[Agayants] Judging from recent reports in the U.S. press, the U.S. Administration is once again getting ready to send new batches of weapons and ammunition to the opposition. THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper, for example, notes that in the near future the rebels are to be sent mortars, artillery shells, missiles, and the means for clearing minefields. But as they are saying in the U.S. capital, this time the Islamic Party of Afghanistan will not be granted this generous aid. According to a report broadcast on London's BBC, a conference in the State Department discussed whether, in light of the recent events in Takhar Province, it is worth curbing or stopping altogether military supplies to Hikmatyar.

[Kornilov] Indeed, Nikolay Ivanovich, it is no accident that Hikmatyar himself hastily flew to the United States in order to ask, to beg his sponsors not to throw him aside, to forget about the so-called Takhar incident and not accord it political significance. At the same time THE WASHINGTON POST writes that the painful losses of the mujahidin have had a sobering influence on the Bush administration. The newspaper calls several tactical methods used by the irreconcilable opposition "disturbing," and asks what the U.S. Administration is doing in order to prevent this, which is leading to the death of innocent civilians.

[Kassis] Precisely civilians. In a recent report from Kabul it says that in the very center of the capital, at the bus stop in the Spinzar area, a missile fell. Surviving passersby threw themselves into helping the wounded, and at that moment yet another missile exploded nearby. The result was sad: There were more than 40 dead and 130 wounded. Such are the truly and unprecedentedly terrible consequences of the shelling of Kabul. And although the mujahidin assert with one voice that their aim is not to kill civilians—in the words of the opposition spokesman, the missiles are being targeted on government institutions and departments—in fact, the explosions are happening near mosques, in markets, and on shopping streets.

[Agayants] And despite the barbaric actions of the opposition, despite the successful onslaughts of the government troops, the Afghan leadership again and again is reiterating its proposal to the leaders of the mujahidin to end combat actions and address all disputed issues around the negotiating table. The latest document of the Supreme Defense Council of Afghanistan says: It is essential to find ways of stopping the bloodshed. And this is what Peter Thompson, the U.S. envoy to the so-called transitional government in Peshawar, thinks in connection with the military failures of the mujahidin in various sectors of military action: The fact that the

Afghan Army has once again established control over positions taken several months ago by the mujahidin is a result not so much of the shortage of weapons and ammunition, as of divisions in the opposition.

[Kornilov] It should be noted that weapons continue to be supplied to the gangs without interruption and, moreover, the stakes concerning these supplies are being raised higher and higher. In any event, this was announced recently by the Bush administration; and so as not to create an outcry among the public, the propaganda issued puts all the blame on Moscow. A highly placed official in the U.S. Administration has announced unprecedented military supplies by the USSR to the Kabul government following the final withdrawal of its troops on 15 February. It is precisely these actions by Moscow, they say, that are forcing Washington to take retaliatory measures.

[Kassis] Yes, these very propagandists have forgotten that it was precisely the Soviet Union that proposed, following the withdrawal of its limited contingent of troops from Afghanistan, a total and immediate end to military aid to the belligerent sides, so that they might more easily come to a political settlement for the entire Afghan problem. What happened? More batches of arms for the mujahidin, the participation of Pakistani regular troops on their side, and the appearance of an ever-greater number of military advisers in the country from Saudi Arabia.

[Agayants] By the end of this month, following a brief break, which some observers rightly call the lull before the next storm, the shelling of towns had again resumed. Moreover, the rockets fell so thick and fast that the opposition came to expect a rapid victory in a number of provinces. But it was profoundly mistaken. Thus, for example, units and subdivisions of the Jalalabad garrison are continuing to unleash offensives on the positions of the insurgents who have entrenched themselves to the southeast of the administrative center of Nangarhar Province. The enemy is losing dozens of men in killed and injured every day. As was stated by one of the leaders of the FRG's Greens Party, Juergen Maier, the opposition is clearly incapable of any political decisions and has still not managed to seize a single major town. The opposition is now acting according to the principle: If you cannot seize a town, it must be destroyed.

[Kornilov] One could add that Juergen Maier has called on Europe to tell the United States, and Pakistan, too, that they will not stay silent in the face of systematic terror toward the Afghan people and the financing of insurgent gangs. By the way, literally the other day Pakistan Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto, during talks in Lahore with Iranian Foreign Minister Velayati, said that Pakistan, I quote, has an interest in finding a political solution in Afghanistan, in stopping further bloodshed, end of quote. If these are not just words, if this is really so, then we can soon hope for positive steps by Islamabad in this complex issue.

[Kassis] And a further aspect to the Afghan problem that I would like to touch on here, Yuriy Emmanuilovich—and that is the liberation of the Soviet soldiers who have been captured in Afghanistan. The other day, you will recall, a delegation of the people's committee Nadezhda flew to Kabul, headed by the writer Prokhanov and the journalist Andronov. Their main aim in visiting Afghanistan was to enlist the support of the Afghan Government in our people's struggle for the liberation of Soviet prisoners of war. Apart from contacts with the Afghan Government, the delegation is trying to establish contacts with representatives of the opposition, too. The important point is that the overwhelming majority of prisoners of war have not committed any crimes against their people, and in this situation we must help them return to their homeland.

[Agayants] But here, as I understand it, there is another problem that we cannot brush aside, for there are also Afghan prisoners of war. During the Nadezhda delegation's talks in Pakistan, by the way, this was discussed too. And it must be noted that the president of the opposition government, Mujadeddi, assured the Soviet representatives that in the event of an agreement being concluded on an exchange, the government soldiers who have been captured would not be forgotten either. Our program has come to an end. We thank you for your attention, comrades. All the best!

United States & Canada

Bush Vetoes Congress Resolution on FS-X Plane

LD0108123889 Moscow TASS in English 1212 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Washington August 1 TASS—By TASS correspondent Aleksey Berezhkov:

U.S. President George Bush has blocked the attempts of the U.S. Congress to toughen terms of an agreement on a joint American-Japanese development and production of the most up-to-date FS-X fighter plane. He vetoed on Monday a binding resolution approved by both chambers which calls for a ban on the transfer to Japan of the production technology of important components of the new plane, defence articles and defence services.

Before taking the decision on the implementation of the FS-X program, the administration undertook its review, says a written statement of President Bush circulated by the white House on Monday. It required additional talks with the Japanese side after which the green light was given to the program.

"I determined that the programme is in the strategic and commercial interests of the United States and will contribute to our security and that of a major ally," the statement says. At the same time, Bush stressed that "to reopen discussions now for additional and needless changes can only damage the prospects for a successful agreement. If this occurs, substantial injury to the U.S.-Japan security relationship is likely." He also pointed out that "the resolution... conflicts with the president's proper authority under the constitution.

However, most congressmen obviously disagree with the conclusions made by the administration. Last May 72 senators voted for imposing major restrictions on the agreement and 27 voted against. Last June the same resolution was approved by 262 congressmen, with 155 voting against it.

Immediately after Bush's statement was circulated in Washington, a number of congressmen announced that they would work for the lifting of the president's veto. These include Richard Gephardt, head of the democratic majority in the House of Representatives, and John Danforth, a Republican and an influential member of the Senate Subcommittee on International Trade.

According to the terms of the deal closed last year and specified by the Bush administration and the Japanese Government early this year, the new fighter plane will be developed jointly by the U.S. corporation General Dynamics and Mitsubishi heavy industries of Japan. The plane called tentatively "experimental support fighter" for the Japanese self-defence force wil be an improved modification of an F-16 plane. A total cost of the project has been estimated at 6 billion dollars.

Congress Cuts Budget for 'Stealth,' SDI

LD3107115289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 31 Jul 89

[Correspondent Boris Kalyagin report from Washington]

[Text] The debate on the country's military budget for the next fiscal year become quite heated in the U.S. Congress. White House statements on its aspiration toward reducing tension are still not reflected in the Pentagon's military plans. On the contrary, the administration is demanding large sums for creating new and more perfect types of weaponry. However, the voices of those opposed to the new costly and dangerous military programs are resounding increasingly loudly from Capitol Hill. The House of Representatives has voted to reduce expenditure allocated for producing the notorious Stealth bomber by $1 billion in 1990. In the last 10 years, $23 billion has been spent on the Stealth program. Furthermore, there has only been one successful test of the new bomber. The guide price of each one of these machines is over $500 million—and the Pentagon intends arming itself with 132 of these aircraft. So, even the preliminary cost of the project is in excess of $70 billion.

Several legislators ask if it is really necessary to invest such excessive sums of money in a military program whose efficiency is not completely clear at a time when there has been a significant improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations. As a result, the House of Representatives expressed itself in favor of allocating funds for the construction of only two bombers next year, and only on condition that the Pentagon puts forward proposals for a sharp reduction in expenditure on Stealth production.

The declaration by U.S. Secretary of Defense Cheney is very typical. He noted that it has now become considerably more complex to push costly military projects directed against the Soviet Union through Congress. This also manifested itself during discussion of funding for the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, better known as the Star Wars program. Some congressmen noted that this program does not have a precise aim. In the time of President Reagan it was asserted that creating some sort of space shield would help protect all Americans from a nuclear strike. Now, however, it is said that SDI is intended to defend U.S. missile bases. But that undermines the Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty, and is an attempt to change the present military balance between the USSR and the United States in their favor.

After a long debate the House of Representatives decided to reduce expenditure on SDI in the next financial year by over $1 billion. The Capitol has viewed the words of USSR Marshal Akhromeyev in Washington quite seriously. Marshal Akhromeyev spoke at hearings in the Armed Forces Committee of the House of Representatives of Congress, and noted that U.S. deployment in space of an antimissile defense system would hinder the concluding of an agreement on reducing strategic offensive weapons.

A reasonable question arises: What is more important for U.S. security—achieving an accord which reduces significantly the level of military confrontation, or spending huge sums on a program with unclear aims and unpredictable consequences, the implementation of which could lead to the destruction of the military and political balance which has evolved. That question remains unanswered.

U.S. Congress Military Budget Debate Cited

PM3107084589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
27 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch by correspondent A. Blinov: "United States: Debates Around Pentagon Budget"]

[Text] U.S. Congress is ending its work before the summer vacation on a high note in disputes about budget questions.

The White House has suggested establishing in fiscal 1990 (it begins 1 October) a ceiling for military expenditure of $305 billion and has compiled a priority list of arms programs. It is these programs which are the subject of the disputes.

Two major programs—the Strategic Defense Initiative ($4.87 billion have been requested for it) and the sophisticated B-2 bomber (a "portion" of the funds totalling $4.7 billion has been allocated to it) have simultaneously become the "bone of contention." The administration's arguments in favor of just large expenditures have given rise to doubt among many members of Congress. To "push" the requested sums through Congress, President Bush had a special meeting with its leaders and Defense Secretary R. Cheney visited the Capitol Hill.

The head of the Pentagon admitted: "The cost of the B-2 is shocking, but the aircraft is extremely necessary." In the search for effective arguments the B-2's supporters are distorting logic. Thus, S. Nunn, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, claimed that without the new aircraft there would be no point in the United States concluding a treaty on a 50-percent reduction of Strategic Nuclear Arsenals. The U.S. nuclear triad, he believes, will be left without bomb carriers capable of overcoming air defense systems while the Soviet Union allegedly has such means.

The head of the analogous committee in the House of Representatives, L. Aspin, is skeptical about the B-2's potential and suggests initially limiting appropriations, especially as Aspin believes that the price for the bomber will obviously eventually be nearly double.

On Tuesday the Senate agreed to earmark $4.4 billion for the B-2 and to build three models of the aircraft on condition that its flying properties are confirmed. The bill prepared in the House of Representatives (there has been no vote there yet) provides for money only for two new bombers.

The "chameleon plan" is what Congresswoman Barbara Boxer called the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative" plan. It is represented either by a "nuclear shield" over the entire United States or "a limited system for defense against accidental nuclear attack." The House of Representatives has suggested reducing SDI appropriations by one-third—to $3.1 billion.

Debates on the military budget do not merely come down to a dispute between "hawks" and "doves." On a number of military programs Congress is going further than the Pentagon and is even refusing it reductions—local interests and the desire to oblige people's "own" corporations are coming into force here. Thus the Pentagon suggested renouncing the plan for the V-22 VTOL aircraft as unsuccessful while members of Congress from Pennsylvania, where it is being developed, want the work to be continued. The plan for the purchase of F-14 fighters, repealed by the Pentagon, has been restored. Congressmen from Long Island state [as published] where the Grumman corporation which produces it is situated have managed to get $1.3 billion dollars allocated for it.

U.S.-USSR Military Contacts 'On the Up'

PM0108102389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
28 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Stanislav Kondrashov article under the rubric "Political Observer's Notes": "How a Soviet Marshal Disarmed the U.S. Congressmen"]

[Text] Upbeat assessments are not in vogue now that the very air, it seems, is imbued with a spirit of critical analysis of the past and the present, but, nonetheless, one cannot fail to be surprised and gratified at the qualitatively new level of contacts between Soviet and U.S. military men. And between the USSR and Britain, if one bears in mind the fact that this week our main military man—Defense Minister D.T. Yazov—is paying an official visit to London, where he met with two British defense ministers (the outgoing G. Younger and the incoming T. King), and addressed journalists and specialist political scientists in an atmosphere of great interest and with invariable success. Success was guaranteed by the unusual nature of the visit and by the readiness for contact and openness now displayed in the West by generals and marshals from Moscow.

Contacts in the military sphere are still highly innovative, and professional politicians and the general public are still reacting keenly to them. Needless to say, the emotional aspect is the most vivid but not the most important side of politics and international relations. It is dangerous to exaggerate its importance. But, on the other hand, the image of the enemy created over decades of the cold war also contains very many emotional aspects—deriving from the purposeful suggestion of hatred. That is why the destruction of the image of the enemy proceeds more rapidly and more effectively at the emotional and subconscious level, when military people acquire a convincingly human face, and when people who had found it highly difficult to relate to each other because of the prevailing tradition of seeing each other merely as targets start to communicate.

It has thus transpired that, among our top military men, Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev has the greatest experience of such contacts. As chief of the General Staff, he first visited the United States during the December 1987 Soviet-U.S. summit. His first appearance at the Pentagon was a sensation. Last summer he paid an official visit overseas, visiting, as I recall, an aircraft carrier, a U.S. Air Force base, and U.S. military exercises. This too was a sensation. And now there is more news from abroad: At the end of last week the Soviet marshal... disarmed the U.S. Congress.

Of course, he has not yet entirely disarmed them. When examining the Bush administration's $305 billion in military appropriations for the next fiscal year, Congress is hardly likely to lop off more than a few billion, if anything. But, at the invitation of the U.S. Congress, S.F. Akhromeyev arrived in Washington as a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions, spoke at hearings at the House Armed Services Committee, and was "disarmingly frank." This was admitted when Congressman Bill Dickinson, who had previously categorically objected to the Soviet marshal appearing on Capitol Hill, shared his impressions. The image of the enemy was clearly disarmed in the heart of this conservative Alabamian too.

The marshal appeared before the congressmen in his military uniform with his ribbon bars. And he spoke for 4 and ½ hours. The auditorium was packed not just with congressmen and journalists, but also with U.S. diplomats and representatives of the intelligence services. At the end of the speech, according to THE NEW YORK TIMES, "the committee members gave him a standing ovation." During the recesses the speaker was asked for his autograph. Of course, Americans love unusual shows, but Les Aspin, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, cannot be called starry-eyed. "The speech was magnificent," he said. "I cannot remember anyone being applauded at a hearing."

Judging by reports, the Soviet guest reported for the first time that it is planned to cut tank production in our country by 40 percent. Apart from this new information he put forward the known Soviet positions on strategic offensive weapons, the ABM Treaty, and the desirability of new talks on cutting naval forces, supplementing, as it were, the Vienna talks on conventional arms in Europe. How was this "thunderous applause" to be explained? By, as NEWSDAY put it, the "detailed knowledge," "sincerity and skillful public speaking," and the same "disarming frankness"? Yes, all that, but above all, I think, by the simple effect of being present. This was a highly successful act of humanization in a sphere where the cause of dehumanization had conquered all. Seeing and hearing the Soviet marshal "at home," I think the U.S. Congressmen felt relieved—realizing that it is possible to live in peace with such military men.

The cause of glasnost in the military sphere is making progress, although insufficiently quickly, in my view. Last summer S.F. Akhromeyev, during his visit to the United States, surprised the Americans by admitting that he—the then chief of the General Staff—did not know the true size of Soviet military spending, since most of this expenditure does not come under the Defense Ministry. Now, as is well known, our actual military budget has been published and turns out to be approximately four times larger than that previously announced (R77.3 billion as against R20.2 billion). At the Congressional hearings the marshal had to convince skeptical Western experts that this spending had again not been under-recorded. We learned from THE NEW YORK TIMES that "Akhromeyev defended these figures in answering committee members' questions. He said that this relatively small figure can partly be explained by the artificially low price of raw materials in the Soviet Union. The marshal also said that this budget figure reflects the fact that Soviet officers earn smaller salaries than their U.S. colleagues."

One point in passing: While being gratified by glasnost, we cannot fail to note that people still love to expand its limits before a foreign audience, reporting there for the first time facts which are unknown to our own audience. Is that the power of tradition? Or is our own audience not meticulous enough and still unused to asking delicate questions about the shifting category of yesterday's or today's military secrets? Here too our hopes are pinned on the mold-breaking Supreme Soviet.

Carried away by the marshal's one-man assault on Capitol Hill, I almost forgot about the recent 10-day visit to the Soviet Union by Admiral W. Crowe, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs. As has been reported, he too was shown a great deal. Crowe described his trip as an "important step forward in the process of establishing mutual trust between military departments that have been in confrontation with each other for decades." Introducing an emotional element, the admiral admitted: "I'm always amazed to be holding such a dialogue with the Soviet military."

Finally, since the events happened close together, I would like to touch in these notes upon the recent Soviet warship visit to the port of Norfolk, the main U.S. Navy base on the Atlantic, and the forthcoming U.S. visit to Sevastopol. In Boston in 1975 I witnessed a preceding visit—two of our destroyers visited the city, while two U.S. ships visited Leningrad. Fourteen years have passed and a very great deal has happened in Soviet-U.S. relations over that period. That was a time of unrealized hopes, the end of detente, and this left a mark of unreality on the exchange of naval visits. Now is a time of new hope, our relations are on the up, and, I would like to believe, will remain that way for a long time to come. Back then the entrance to Chesapeake Bay, where the Norfolk Naval Base is located, was carefully shielded from Soviet eyes. I remember when our cruise liner the "Mikhail Lermontov" had to wait for nightfall before entering the bay and passing by Norfolk on its return to Baltimore from the Caribbean—it was not allowed to enter in daylight. Now a Soviet missile cruiser accompanied by a destroyer and a tanker have spent 5 days in this prohibited zone.

Without getting emotional, let us get down to rational politics. Improvements in this area do not come about overnight, they only emerge as a result of dogged work to overcome heavy structures that have built up over a long time. On the realistic political level Adm Crowe concluded: "Although I learned a great deal about prospects, my opinion of our bilateral relations has basically not changed... Although there are hopeful signs, they have still not become reality. Both then and now I advise acting purposefully and cautiously, and whenever it clearly accords with our national interests. Needless to say, we must make use of any opportunities opened up by current trends to move away from the confrontational legacy of the postwar era."

Well, the framework of what is under way has been defined quite soberly, and the general direction of progress suits both sides.

Goranskiy on U.S. Secret Installations

OW0108150989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1135 GMT 31 Jul 89

[From the "World Today" program presented by Igor Goranskiy]

[Text] The action plan in case of a nuclear war is one the most carefully guarded U.S. secrets. It includes a list of measures to ensure the security of the military-political leadership of the country in case of a nuclear attack.

The Reagan administration spent more than $3 billion for the modernization of underground bunkers for the U.S. leadership. Special White House and Pentagon computers constantly follow the movements of the 17 possible successors to the president in case of his death, as has been envisaged by law. In this connection, a condition that at least one of them should not be in Washington is inviolable. In case of necessity, a special helicopter can in 10 minutes transfer the president to the capital's Andrews Air Force Base, where a Boeing 747 equipped to became a flying command post is on a permanent standby. Other 46 key leaders of the country are the subject for an immediate evacuation to underground shelters. Pentagon has prepared at least 50 underground bunkers in various parts of the United States. Each of them is theoretically capable of becoming the headquarters of the U.S. Government. Satellite and other communication systems connect these shelters with each other, as well as with the system of underground and command centers of the Department of Defense.

In an attempt to ensure total secrecy of this projects, the administration took it out of the control of the Congress. This, however, led to abuses. Presently, according to the U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, this project has become the subject of study by the investigation services of the Pentagon and the Department of Justice, as well as by experts of the Congress and judicial organs.

It has been established that five supermodern communication systems that had been used in the project and that cost several billion dollars are incompatible with each other. The investigation has also revealed that, in the interest of secrecy, the government distributed contracts among the same companies and that the expenditure estimate was unreasonably high. In a number of cases, the quality of work of construction of the underground shelters was also found to be poor.

The Congress plans to hold next fall a number of hearings on the lack of the necessary control over the Pentagon's supersecret projects.

China

Blagoveshchensk, Heihe Get Radio Telephone Link

OW2807121889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 25 Jul 89

[V. Kovalchuk video report from the "Vremya" newscast, including recorded interview with V.F. Utoplov, Amur Oblast communications administration chief—date and place not given; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] The first direct international radio telephone communications station between Blagoveshchensk and Heihe City in the PRC, has been commissioned for permanent use. [Video cuts from studio to show promenade along the Amur River bank]

[Kovalchuk] Natural barriers such as the Amur river have always played a perceptible role in the history of Soviet-Chinese border relations. For nearly 4 months of the year, when the ice breaks up or when the river is frozen, the river practically excluded contacts between the two sides. And now, a reliable electronic bridge has been established over the largest river in the Far East through the joint efforts of Soviet and Chinese specialists. With the modern telefax equipment installed on both sides of the river, the station is capable of ensuring radiotelephone as well as facsimile communications.

The station, built with both Soviet and Chinese equipment, will undoubtedly further promote more rapid development of trade, economic, and cultural ties between the Soviet Amur Oblast and Heilongjiang Province in the PRC. [Video shows a small facsimile machine, telephone equipment, a relay tower, and Soviet and Chinese technicians, then cuts to show V.F. Utoplov, Amur Oblast communications administration chief, being interviewed]

[Begin Utoplov recording] Work is already underway to install direct telephone communications between our ports and theirs. The question of establishing a direct radiotelephone link between Blagoveshchensk, Heihe, Harbin, and Beijing is being looked at and other work is being carried out. A commission for reviewing the questions of developing radio and television along the Soviet-Chinese border has been established. Its aim is to ban the further creation of mutual radio and television interference.

A real opportunity has appeared to provide timely notification and take operative measures to eliminate natural calamities, such as floods and forest fires. Life presents many issues and with the assistance of communications systems we will be able to solve them in an operative and efficient way. [end recording]

Moscow Radio Interviews Song Jian

OW0108204889 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 26 Jul 89

[Text] Dear listeners and friends: We have already reported on the end of the visit of a Chinese Government delegation to the Soviet Union. This delegation was headed by Song Jian, China's state councillor and minister of China's state scientific and technological commission. This delegation took part in the Chinese scientific and technological day activities sponsored by the Soviet Union. Before his departure from the Soviet Union for home, the head of the Chinese Government delegation spoke with our station reporter. The following is what they discussed.

Our reporter asked: Comrade Song Jian, how would you evaluate the Chinese scientific and technological day activities held in the Soviet Union?

Song Jian answered: The Chinese scientific and technological day activities and Chinese scientific and technological exhibition have been held in Moscow. The exhibition is a success. Some 150,000 Soviets have visited the exhibition. Their impressions of the exhibition have been very positive. Through this exhibition, Soviet people can see the achievements that China has scored in scientific and technological areas in the past 10 years, particularly in the decade of reform and opening to the outside world. We are very thankful for the support given by the Soviet viewers about our work. We also want to express our thanks for the support and help given by various departments of the Soviet Government, the Council of Ministers, the CPSU Central Committee, and various levels of leading comrades for our exhibition. I think that through this exhibition the Soviet scientific and technological circles will enhance their understanding of and give support to the achievements that Chinese science and technology has made in the past several years. I think that following the summit meeting between China and the Soviet Union in May of this year, the resumption of the normalization of relations between the party and government of China and the Soviet Union, and the agreements reached by the supreme leaders of both countries, we will bid goodbye to the past and look forward to the future. First, there are bright prospects and great potential for cooperation in the area of science and technology. During the exhibition, many Soviet scientists and technicians expressed a strong wish to enter into cooperation with Chinese counterparts. Prospects are also bright in the area of basic research, research and development in high technology, and scientific and technological cooperation in the area of traditional industries. We will do our best to bring about further development in this area. We also hope that Soviet friends will cooperate with us. This kind of cooperation will benefit the people of our two countries and help to strengthen the friendship between the peoples of the two countries.

Our reporter said: Thank you. Here is my second question. What in your view, will be the brightest prospects for cooperation between the scholars of two countries? Did you discuss new cooperative projects during this visit?

Song Jian replied: We stayed 10 days in the Soviet Union. We visited Moscow, Leningrad, Novosibirsk, Khabarovsk, and Vladivostok. We visited many research institutes of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and research organizations under various Soviet ministries. We also visited state-run cooperatives and some enterprises. We deeply feel the warm welcome that the Soviet people and Soviet scientific and technological circles gave us. We also feel that they appreciate the work of Chinese science and technology and show good will toward Chinese scientific and technological circles. Therefore, I can say that our cooperation has a good foundation. At the same time, we have a deep impression that the Soviet scientific and technological circles have scored tremendous achievements in many areas; among them are leading world space industry, aviation industry, biotechnology, information technology, and many other areas. These achievements are, for us, worth studying and cooperating with the Soviet scientific and technological circles. Of course, we also take pride in the fact that in the decade of reform and opening to the outside world, China has, in many areas, approached the world's advanced level or reached the world level. On this basis, I think the cooperation between us has a firm foundation.

Song Jian added: I think cooperation is in the interests of both countries. In my opinion, if this kind of cooperation continues in the future, it will benefit the development of science and technology for both the Soviet Union and China. Here, I want to particularly mention the great achievements that Soviet comrades have scored in space technology. I also heard that the Soviet Union has a grand plan to send humans to Mars and to probe the geographic structure of Mars, as well as to probe the possible existence of living beings on Mars. Of course, Soviet comrades have also scored great achievements in the aviation industry. Soviet scientists have done a very good job in the area of biotechnology, the information industry, automation, and new materials. I think Chinese scientists can learn from the Soviet comrades in this area. Of course, Soviet scientists may possibly learn a few things from the work of Chinese scientists. I hope we can better cooperate in the area of high technology in the future. As for traditional industry, the strength of Soviet comrades and the economic power of the Soviet state are much stronger than those of China. In the past, the Soviet Union supplied much machinery to China in its First 5-Year Plan. Some of our old and big plants are still using the machinery from the Soviet Union. I think that cooperation in the area of traditional industry should also be one of the main points of cooperation. On the other hand, we also know that the Soviet Union still has some difficulties in the area of the light industry market and consumer goods. I think Chinese people and Chinese industry, light industry, the food processing industry, and agriculture can, through cooperation, offer some help to the Soviet people in overcoming their difficulties.

Northeast Asia

Outcome of Japan's Upper House Elections Noted
OW2807121189 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 25 Jul 89

[Text] Elections were held in Japan on 23 July to elect half of the upper house seats and the final outcome was announced on 24 July. In this connection, Moscow Radio Tokyo correspondent Potapov reports as follows:

A crushing defeat of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party [LDP] in the elections was anticipated even before the outcome of the elections was officially announced and bleak predictions for the LDP in the elections turned out to be true. The LDP's crushing defeat in the elections aroused a major storm in Japanese mass media. Presently, the LDP holds 109 seats in the upper house while opposition parties hold 143 seats. Prime Minister Uno announced that he would resign as the the president of the ruling party and as prime minister at a news conference on 24 July. Prime Minster Uno is going to resign to take responsibility for losing the upper house elections by a large margin and the majority in the upper house.

On the contrary, the Japan Socialist Party [JSP] made a big advance in the elections and increased its seats from 42 to 66 in the upper house. At a news conference, JSP Chairwoman Takako Doi stated as follows: All JSP members feel heavy responsibility and I think that we must unite forces of the opposition camp. The opposition side plans to press the LDP hard for the dissolution of the lower house and general elections. She also called on the LDP to hand over the government to an interim government to this end and declared that the JSP would take over the interim government. LDP leaders are striving to prevent the political situation from further aggravating and some people within the LDP are seeking a successor to Prime Minister Uno. Political Reform Implementation Committee Chairman Ito, former Prime Minister Fukuta, Mr Komoto, leader of the Kmoto faction and former Deputy Prime Minister Kanamaru are surfacing as potential candidates for prime minister.

Fisheries Minister Ends Visit to Japan
LD2907135189 Moscow TASS in English 1336 GMT 29 Jul 89

[Text] Tokyo July 29 TASS—The state of and prospects for further development of Soviet-Japanese relations in the fields of fisheries were discussed at talks in Tokyo between Soviet Fisheries Minister Nikolay Kotlyar and Hisao Horinouchi, Japanese minister of farming forestry and fisheries.

During the meetings which were held in a friendly atmosphere, the sides reaffirmed mutual intention to make efforts to broaden cooperation in the field of fisheries under the current inter-governmental agreements and proceeding from the principle of mutual benefit.

The advisability of creating favourable conditions for the development of long-term contacts between the two countries' organisations and enterprises concerned was expressed.

The Soviet minister stayed here from July 24 to 29 at the invitation of the Japanese Government. During his stay in Japan he was received by the country's Foreign Minister Hiroshi Mitsuzuka.

Lukyanov, Primakov Receive DPRK Delegation
LD0108043589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1535 GMT 31 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 31 Jul (TASS)—Today Anatoliy Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, met in the Kremlin with a DPRK parliamentary delegation headed by Yang Hyong-sop, chairman of the standing committee of the country's Supreme People's Assembly. The delegation is on an official friendly visit to the USSR.

Mutual satisfaction at the dynamic development of Soviet-Korean relations was expressed during the conversation.

The sides discussed a number of international problems, particularly the situation on the Korean peninsula and around it. Yang Hyong-sop explained the essence of the DPRK's initiatives in reducing the level of military confrontation on the peninsula and creating conditions for the renewal of a constructive dialogue between both parts of Korea. Anatoliy Lukyanov stressed that, for its part, the USSR is in solidarity with the DPRK's policy towards a political settlement in Korea on the basis of the withdrawal of U.S. troops and toward the development of relations and contacts between north and south aimed at restoring the country's national unity.

The sides spoke out in favor of stepping up the efforts of both countries' parliaments in consolidating peace in the Far East and in Asia, and in strengthening cooperation between the countries of the Asia-Pacific region.

The conversation passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

The same day a conversation took place between Yevgeniy Primakov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the delegation. The guests were informed about the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

DPRK Legislators Visit Uzbekistan

PM2707153789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Tashkent, 26 Jul—A DPRK parliamentary delegation has arrived in Uzbekistan. It is headed by Yang Hyong-sop, chairman of the Standing Committee of the DPRK Supreme People's Assembly. The delegation is visiting our country at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The guests were received by M.I. Ibragimov, chairman of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium. He briefed the guests on the progress of perestroyka in the republic, the growing role of the soviets, and the changes in the electoral system.

ROK Business Delegation Visits Moscow

LD0108032889 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 31 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 31 TASS—The biggest South Korean delegation of business people ever to visit the Soviet Union opened talks today at the national Chamber of Commerce and Industry in Moscow.

The visit has been sponsored by the Korea Trade Promotion Corporation (KOTRA), which opened a permanent office in the Soviet capital earlier this month. The USSR and South Korea do not have diplomatic relations.

The talks are being held to exchange information about prospects for business cooperation between the two countries, form direct contacts between South Korean firms and Soviet enterprises, and discuss opportunities for broadening traditional trade and launching joint ventures and other new forms of interaction.

A number of South Korean companies, including such well-known ones as Hyundai and Lucky Gold Star, are already negotiating joint production operations with Soviet partners.

The visitors are especially interested in Soviet plans to comprehensively develop the Far East. They mentioned fisheries, the lumbering industry, port and housing modernisation in Soviet Far Eastern cities, and hotel and office construction among the priority areas of Soviet-South Korean cooperation. All these projects could be pursued in the form of partnerships.

The South Korean business people came to Moscow after visiting a number of Soviet Far Eastern cities. They are to hold numerous meetings with representatives of local organisations and factories.

Commentary on U.S.-ROK Security Conference

18070338 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 25 Jul 89 p 3

[Article by Yuriy Starostenko: "Political Anarchism"]

[Text] The 21st American-South Korean security conference was held in Washington. The circumstances that preceded the talks of the defense ministries of the United States and South Korea were unusual: Recently in Seoul and Washington there have been increased appeals for a reduction of the 43,000-man American expeditionary force stationed in South Korea.

Certain South Korean opposition activists and radical students think that the presence of American troops impedes successful negotiations on the question of unifying the homeland. Moreover the South Koreans are tired of the excesses of the Yankees who, according to calculations, commit an average of five crimes a day against the local population. At the end of June three American senators introduced a draft law which envisions withdrawing 10,000 American military servicemen from the southern part of the Korean peninsula during the next 3 years. And one senator even called for withdrawing all troops with the exception of 3,000 men. The legislators' position is explained by the considerable burden of financial expenditures that it costs the American treasury to maintain a large military grouping in South Korea and the moods currently widespread in the United States in favor of reducing military expenditures.

Unfortunately, R. Cheney and his South Korean counterpart Lee Sang Hoon did not take advantage of the opportunity presented to them. The U.S. defense minister again gave his assurances and also the assurances of

U.S. President G. Bush that the U.S. forces would remain in South Korea. The South Korean minister, who had been instructed by his government to maintain the status quo in the military alliance of the two countries, heard this with satisfaction.

Nonetheless the withdrawal of American troops from South Korea is an imperative of modern times and the increasing demand of the South Korean and American peoples, which the Seoul and Washington administrations are trying to oppose by promoting the worn-out thesis of possible "aggression from the north." The intention to retain an American military presence on the borders of the DPRK, the Soviet Union and China stands in contradiction to the growing tendency toward relaxation of international tensions and the withdrawal of foreign troops of others' territories. The peoples of Northeast Asia hope that this anachronism in U.S. policy will be overcome since it is standing in the way of mending the split between the Korean people which has lasted almost a half century.

Near East & South Asia

Further Reportage on Shevardnadze's Visit to Iran

More on Discussion With Velayati

LD0108120889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1042 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Tehran, 1 Aug (TASS)—Talks began this morning between E.A. Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR foreign minister, who is here on a visit and A.A. Velayati, minister of foreign affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

It was with satisfaction that the ministers noted that 1989 is becoming a real turning point in Soviet-Iranian relations which have taken on a new quality of goodneighborliness.

The Moscow summit meeting and the talks between M.S. Gorbachev and A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani had landmark significance. Regular and intensive contacts between the two countries' diplomatic departments have played a useful part and continue to do so. This is now the fifth meeting between their leaders this year.

Talks to develop fundamental decisions taken at a political level are being held through the channels of various ministries and departments.

The processes occurring in Soviet-Iranian relations are stimulating enhanced interest around the world: sometimes amicable, at times cautious.

Meanwhile, E.A. Shevardnadze noted, nothing unusual is happening. The state of affairs in the past when the Soviet Union and Iran did not have normal relations, was unnatural. Now the anomaly is being overcome, and relations are being built on a base of respect for sovereignty, independence, and individuality.

A.A. Velayati, minister of foreign affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran, agreed with this assessment.

There was detailed discussion of certain specific matters relating to Soviet-Iranian economic cooperation.

During discussion of international matters, the ministers noted with regret the absence of progress in the matter of a final Iran- Iraqi settlement.

A.A. Velayati stressed the absence on the part of Iran of any plans to overthrow the Iraqi regime, or to interfere in Iraq's domestic affairs, and he stated the exclusively peaceful intentions of the Iranian leadership.

E.A. Shevardnadze pointed to the importance of continuing political efforts and the negotiating process, saying there is no other way.

The task of ending the bloodshed in Afghanistan remains a priority. The ministers confirmed the importance and necessity of forming a broadly representative government in Afghanistan, which might take account of the interests of various groups in the country's population.

On the same day there was a meeting between the Soviet minister and A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani, Majlis speaker of the Islamic Republic of Iran, who was recently elected president of the country.

Visit Summarized

LD0108195189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1805 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Tehran, 1 Aug (TASS)—E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and USSR foreign minister, was in Tehran on a short working visit. He had a meeting with A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani, president of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

E.A. Shevardnadze presented to him greeting and best wishes from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretray of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in connection with his election to the post of president of Iran.

In the course of the talks that took place, it was noted that in the relations between the Soviet Union and Iran the principles of goodneighborliness and equal mutually advantageous cooperation are being more and more solidly affirmed. The norms of human relations formed the basis of the Soviet-Iranian documents signed in the course of the visit to the USSR of A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani, the fundamental declaration on the principles of relations and friendly cooperation between the USSR and Iran.

A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani expressed gratitude to M.S. Gorbachev for the greetings and for the cordial reception accorded him in Moscow.

A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani stressed that his negotiations with the Soviet leader had been positively received in Iran and are evaluated there as responding to the spirit of the times and to the traditional aspirations of two neighboring peoples.

The progress of the fulfilment of the Soviet-Iranian accords reached in Moscow was examined in a businesslike and considered manner. There was satisfaction that both sides have been taking practical steps aimed at imparting a new quality to the multifarious bilateral cooperation that corresponds to the level of their political relations. Within a certain time, it will be possible to begin preparations for a joint Soviet-Iranian space flight.

The intention of the leadership of the Soviet Union and Iran to keep these questions permanently in the sphere of their increased attention was reaffirmed.

During a discussion of international matters, note was made of the drawing together of the positions of the Soviet Union and Iran in relation to ways toward a cease-fire in Afghanistan and the establishment of an inter-Afghan dialogue aimed at setting up a broad-based representative government that reflects the interests of all Afghans. The idea of an international conference on Afghanistan is worthy of attention.

E.A. Shevardnadze stressed that the Soviet leadership is focusing particular attention on the question of the release of the Soviet prisoners-of-war captured by the Mujahidin. He asked the Iranian president to use his personal authority to work toward this objective. A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani received this request with understanding.

E.A. Shevardnadze touched on the question of the aggravation of the situation in Lebanon, including events in connection with the kidnapping of Shaykh 'Ubayd, one of the Shi'ite leaders, and the execution of the U.S. citizen Higgins, who had been taken hostage. Serious concern was expressed from the Soviet side at these acts of terrorism and their possible consequences.

Having expressed deep regret about what has happened, A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani confirmed that Iran has no connection with the tragedy played out in Lebanon. The sides condemned any acts of a terrorist kind and called for the adoption of urgent measures to prevent a further exacerbation of the situation.

During discussion of the Iran-Iraq conflict, the sides spoke in favor of further efforts toward advancing the negotiation process. The Iranian side gave a high appraisal of the Soviet Union's constructive standpoint, aimed at helping to establish peace and calm in the region.

E.A. Shevardnadze met Mir Hoseyn Musavi, prime minister of Iran.

During an examination of matters concerning bilateral cooperation, they noted the increased dynamism in relations between the Soviet Union and Iran in the spirit of goodneighborliness. They also stressed the fundamental significance for the development of the whole complex of Soviet-Iranian ties of the talks held in Moscow in June between M.S. Gorbachev and A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani, and of the documents signed at the end of the talks, which determined the principles and spheres of Soviet-Iranian cooperation for the long-term future. It was stressed that the Moscow accords open up a new opportunities for taking the mutual desire for the development of bilateral relations into the sphere of specific practical deeds.

Within the context of the renewal processes affecting all aspects of society's life which are going on in the Soviet Union, E.A. Shevardnadze dealt with the fundamental principles of the Soviet foreign policy concept, which is based on the new political thinking. Both sides expressed an interest in fuller utilization of the existing potential for interaction in international affairs in the interests of strengthening peace and security and unblocking conflict situations.

E.A. Shevardnadze held talks with A.A. Velayati, minister of foreign affairs of Iran.

The ministers noted with satisfaction that 1989 truly is becoming a year of breakthrough in Soviet-Iranian relations, which have acquired a new quality of goodneighborliness.

The summit-level talks in Moscow between M.S. Gorbachev and A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani were of landmark significance. A useful role was and still is played by the regular and intensive contacts of the two countries' diplomatic departments—this is already the fifth meeting of their leaders this year.

Talks are being held at the level of various ministries and departments to develop the the fundamental decisions taken at a political level.

E.A. Shevardnadze noted that the ongoing processes in Soviet-Iranian relations are causing heightened interest in the world, sometimes benevolent, at times alarmed.

Meanwhile, E.A. Shevardnadze noted, nothing unusual is happening. The situation in the past, when there were no normal relations between the Soviet Union and Iran, was unnatural. Now this anomaly is being overcome and relations are being built on the basis of respect for sovereignty, independence, and the unique nature [samobytnost] of the two countries.

A.A. Velyati agreed with this appraisal.

Certain specific questions of Soviet-Iranian economic cooperation were discussed in detail.

During a discussion of international problems, the ministers noted with regret the absence of progress in the matter of a final Iran-Iraq settlement.

A.A. Velyati stressed that Iran had no plans to interfere in Iraq's internal affairs, and spoke of the Iranian leadership's exclusively peaceful intentions. E.A. Shevardnadze pointed to the importance of continuing the political efforts of the process of negotiations; there was no other way. The situation in Lebanon was given thorough examination. An understanding was reached on holding consultations on Lebanon in the near future at the expert level, with a follow-up report to ministers on their results.

The ministers reaffirmed the priority nature of the task to end the bloodshed in Afghanistan. They compared their appraisals of recent events in that country and around it and the prospects for their future development.

The talks were held in an open and constructive atmosphere.

Shevardnadze Ends Visit

LD0108185289 Moscow TASS in English 1840 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Tehran August 1 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has wound up his working visit to Tehran at the invitation of 'Ali Akbar Velayati, foreign minister of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

He conducted talks with Iranian officials on a further development of Soviet-Iranian relations, several international and regional problems, including the situation in Afghanistan.

Returns to Moscow

LD0208081189 Moscow TASS in English 0802 GMT 2 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow August 2 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and Soviet foreign minister, returned to Moscow from Tehran today. He paid a short working visit to Iran.

The welcoming party at the airport included Jean-Marie Merillon, French ambassador to the USSR, and 'Ali Reza Bikdeli, charge d'affaires ad intermim of Iran in the USSR.

Commentary on Relations With Iran

LD0108141189 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] The Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, is in Tehran on a working visit. His talks with the Iranian leaders will concentrate on further bilateral relations and a number of international and regional issues including Afghanistan. Yuriy Solton has compiled this commentary:

Shevardnadze is the first foreign dignitary to be invited to Tehran in the wake of Hashemi-Rafsanjani being elected the country's new president. Among other things, this indicates a continuing improvement in bilateral relations. These relations have not always been good, but Moscow believes strongly in the need for good-neighborhood and broad cooperation with Tehran.

A turn here came a month ago when Mikhail Gorbachev met Hashemi-Rafsanjani in Moscow to sign a declaration on the principles of bilateral relations. These relations the declaration stressed, must be based on equality, respect of each other's sovereignty and noninterference in each other's affairs. The sides signed an agreement on economic, scientific and technological cooperation to the turn of the century. They revealed close views on the ways to tackle a number of international issues.

Standing out in the present talks is the Afghan issue. Iran has a common border with Afghanistan and, like Pakistan, harbors many Afghan refugees. It has also given shelter to the Afghan opposition leaders of the so-called Group of Eight. Clearly, Iran will have a large part to play in Afghan settlement. One can see with satisfaction that President Hashemi-Rafsanjani is speaking out for a political solution to the issue. In his view, now that the Soviet troops have left Afghanistan, it is up to the Afghans to shape their future without outside interference. The present talks in Tehran can facilitate the solution of the Afghan problem.

It should be noted that a broader Soviet-Iranian cooperation is aimed against no third country. Even so, certain quarters have long been trying to spoil the two countries' relations. Today they try to distort the Soviet Union's decision to grant military aid to Iran. They portray it as a threat to other, above all, Arab states. But these allegations are a plain provocation. At the Moscow talks, the Soviet Union and Iran spelled out such common goals as complete settlement of the Iran-Iraq conflict, turning the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean into a zone of peace, and peaceful settlement of the conflicts elsewhere. These goals are to be confirmed at the present talks. A better relationship between Moscow and Tehran would help to stabilize southwest Asia as well as benefit the two countries.

Gorbachev Sends Message to Rafsanjani

PM0208104989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Aug 89 Second Edition p 1

[Text of message from Gorbachev to Iranian President Hashemi-Rafsanjani]

[Text] To His Excellency Mr 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, president of the Islamic Republic of Iran

I congratulate you on your election to the eminent post of president of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Your recent official visit to the Soviet Union and the talks held in Moscow undoubtedly promoted further all-around development of Soviet-Iranian relations and the consolidation in them of an atmosphere of good-neighborliness and mutual understanding according with the interests of our two countries and the Soviet and Iranian peoples.

I wish you successes and I wish the Iranian people prosperity.
M. Gorbachev.

Soviet-U.S. Talks on Afghanistan Termed 'Frank'

LD0108230689 Moscow TASS in English 2115 GMT
1 Aug 89

[Text] Stockholm August 2 TASS—By TASS correspondent Dmitry Gorokhov:

Soviet-American Consultations on Afghanistan ended here Tuesday. They were conducted between Nikolay Kozyrev, Soviet ambassador at large, and John Kelly, assistant secretary of state for near east and south asian affairs. The two held a frank and in-depth exchange of opinions concerning the search for ways of a political settlement to the Afghan problem. The sides presented their evaluations of the situation in Afghanistan and the outlook for its development. Despite the different approaches, the consultations were useful, and the sides expressed their intention to continue the consultations in the near future.

Nikolay Kozyrev and Soviet ambassador to Sweden Boris Pankin were received by Swedish foreign Minister Sten Andersson. The Soviet officials presented in detail the Soviet position on the Afghan problems and on safeguarding peace and security in individual regions.

On the same day a press conference was given by the head of the Soviet delegation at the consultations, at the USSR Embassy. The settlement in Afghanistan, Kozyrev said, is a complex process. It is important that all its participants become aware of this: There is no military solution to the problem. The only alternative is a political settlement on the basis of a reasonable compromise, with the participation of all the forces operating on the national arena.

Questioned by newsmen, Kozyrev reported that during the consultations the Soviet representatives expressed the concern felt in the USSR over the fate of Soviet servicemen taken prisoner by the Afghan opposition. The U.S. delegation was informed about the steps being taken in this connection by the Soviet public. The hope was expressed that the American side will help, in accordance with the statement of U.S. President George Bush, to clarify the question of the fate of Soviet servicemen.

Talks End in 'Failure'

LD0108182689 Stockholm Domestic Service
in Swedish 1600 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Correspondent Staffan Heimerson's report on joint Soviet-U.S. talks on Afghanistan held in Stockholm 31 July-1 August; recorded passages in English; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] [Announcer] For 2 days the United States and the Soviet Union discussed the crisis in Afghanistan during a meeting in Stockholm. But the result of the meeting was disappointing. The superpowers could not agree on any matter.

[Correspondent] The secretive meeting between the superpowers in Stockholm on the subject of Afghanistan ended totally without results. The head of the Soviet delegation Ambassador Kozyrev, came out first (?directly after) a courtesy visit to Foreign Minister Andersson [word indistinct] palace, and said:

[Begin recording] [Kozyrev] We will try to do our very best for a peaceful settlement in Afghanistan.

[Correspondent] But did you have any concrete results? [Kozyrev laughs] [end recording]

[Correspondent] Half an hour later the U.S. assistant secretary of state came through the same gate and said:

[Begin recording] [Assistant secretary of State John Kelly] We continue to believe that the will of the Afghan people is that there should be a different regime in Kabul. The Soviet Government now obviously has a different view of that. [end recording]

[Correspondent] A vast difference of opinion—in other words, a failure for the conference even though it was diplomatically softened and sometimes hidden under laughter. The Russian spoke about striving for peace, and the American that there must be a new government in Kabul. For 2 days the small but high-ranking delegations talked with each other here in Stockholm; this was the first time the United States and the Soviet Union had discussed the question over Afghanistan since the Soviet Union began withdrawing its troops from Afghanistan last spring. Now in Stockholm the Soviet Union has tried to get the Americans to stop their large arms deliveries to the Mujahidin and the Afghan guerilla freedom movement. This was without result.

The United States on the other hand tried to get the Soviet Union to support the regime led by President Najibullah in Kabul. This was likewise without result. Ambassador Kozyrev on the contrary underlined the support of the Soviet Union for the Afghan Communist leader. All parties must participate in a future coalition government, and the ambassador described Najibullah as a skillful, wise statesman.

More Commentary on Talks

LD0108054789 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 31 Jul 89

[Vadislav Kozyakov commentary, read by announcer]

[Text] A Soviet ambassador-at-large Nikolay Kozyrev and American Assistant Secretary of State John Kelly have begun to discuss the developments in Afghanistan in the capital of Sweden, Stockholm. Vladislav Kozyakov comments:

This meeting is a good opportunity to help gain peace, and on the basis concordant with the goals proclaimed by Washington, it is only necessary to pass from words to actions. Recently the U.S. President and the Pakistani prime minister spoke in favor of searching for a political settlement. In Stockholm now this can be reaffirmed with something practical since the Soviet Union firmly adheres to the idea of negotiations between the warring sides in Afghanistan.

Washington officials have proclaimed their adherence to democratic processes. In this context the door to solution is opened. Kabul has agreed to forming a government with the involvement of all political forces and holding free elections under international supervision. President Najibullah will be ready to give up his post if his opponents win such elections.

As for the issue of arms supplies, the U.S. justifies its military aid to the Mujahidins with reference to Soviet arms shipments to Kabul. This obstacle too is surmountable since Moscow is prepared to reach an agreement on the reciprocal cessation of arms deliveries.

In my view, writes Vladislav Kozyakov, the situation can be assessed in the following way: The groundwork for Soviet-American cooperation aimed at reaching a peaceful settlement in Afghanistan has been laid, it's up to the United States Administration to use it. In the meantime, the latest reports are disquieting. Washington officials have announced that new types of American weaponry will be shipped to the Mujahidin. The United States is getting prepared for a major guerrilla offensive during the remaining fighting season. Peter Tomsen, a special U.S. envoy to the Mujahidin, confirmed this speaking at the congress on Thursday.

Is it in the national interests of the American people to kindle the war in Afghanistan, not search for peace? There is an aspect here that cannot fail to concern the Americans. It's the attitude to Islamic fundamentalism. According to reports in Stockholm, American diplomacy intends to warn against the possibility of Iranian fundamentalists getting Soviet weapons as a result of developing Soviet-Iranian relations. In the meantime, American weapons dispatched for the Afghan opposition fall precisely into the hands of Islamic fundamentalists. The lion's share of American military aid finds its way to the grouping belonging to the Hezb-e Eslami party led by Gulbuddin Hikmatyar, foreign minister in the so-called interim government. His grouping rejects the search for peace. It stops at nothing, not even at terror against other Mujahidin groupings.

World Reacts Sharply to Report of Higgins Killing

LD0108134489 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] The news of the execution of the American Colonel William Higgins, the head of a group of the United nations military observers in southern Lebanon, by the Shi'ite Oppressed of the World organization has caused an immediate sharp reaction in the world. President Bush of the United States has voiced his indignation over this violent killing. The White House has been reported to consider a long list of various retaliatory measures. Aleksandr Pogodin has this comment.

The reaction of the United Nations Security Council is very indicative. The Council's unanimously adopted resolution underlines that the capturing of hostages and kidnapping people is a serious violation of international law. The resolution presses for an immediate release of all hostages and abducted people, no matter who seized them and where they have been kept. I'd like to call your attention to the fact that the Security council document speaks about all cases of the seizure of hostages and people's kidnapping. This is very important because Col Higgins's dramatic fate cannot be considered outside the general situation in the Middle East and concrete developments in the past few days.

Let us recall that several days ago Israeli commandos abducted in southern Lebanon the religious leader of the Hizballah grouping, 'Abd al-Karim 'Ubayd, and his two relatives. Col Higgins was executed following the refusal by the Israeli authorities to release those kidnapped. The connection between these two events has been stressed in the United States as well. REUTERS news agency has quoted an unidentified American official as expressing his anger over the fact that while making its move Israel did not even think about its possible consequences, nor did it notify the United States about it. Robert Dole, the Republican leader in the Senate, spoke about Israel's lack of responsibility.

The Israeli Government tries to justify its actions that have caused a whole chain of violence by the need to work to combat terrorism, but it is plainly obvious that to try to eradicate the evil of terrorism with the help of the state-supported terrorism means to commit an even bigger crime against humanity, and more people die as a result. Principles of international law and sovereignty of states, to say nothing of moral principles and justice, are sacrificed. Thus the vicious circle of violence and bloodshed forms and the general situation deteriorates. It looks very much like the Israeli authorities counted on exactly such consequences when they passed their decision on an act of state-supported terrorism: the abduction of people in southern Lebanon.

Report of Higgins Killing Viewed

PM0208091589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Aug 89 Second Edition p 5

[Yuriy Glukhov "Observer's Opinion"]

[Text] The world has been perturbed by the reports from the Near East. The United States, which has lost one of its citizens, has been traumatized. The relations and friends of 15 other foreign hostages in the hands of terrorists in Lebanon have been alarmed. Their lives are also under threat.

International terrorism has again issued a challenge to the world community and the United Nations, whose diplomatic immunity Higgins enjoyed when he was in the ranks of the UN temporary forces in Lebanon. The world public, including the public in the Arab countries, is unanimous in condemning terror. Effective measures are needed to halt it in all forms and manifestations without exception.

In this connection Tel Aviv's position draws the attention. Literally the other day Israeli commandos carried out a special raid in Lebanon. Landing by helicopter in the settlement of Jibshit, they abducted Shaykh A.K. 'Ubayd, killing one of his body guards. Essentially an act of terrorism aggravated by murder was committed. And subsequently its organizers also intended to behave like terrorists. They counted on initiating a barter process and exchanging 'Ubayd, regarded as one of the leaders of the "Hizballah" Shi'ite organization, for previously captured Israeli soldiers or for Higgins himself. But, as we can see, it was this criminal action which provoked the tragic course of events.

It is hard not to agree with the opinion of Robert Dole, leader of the Republic minority in the Senate, who expressed anger at Israel's actions. "I hope that the Israelis will think again about how some of their actions may jeopardize the lives of Americans," he said. "To say that the administration is displeased with Israel's action is to put it extremely mildly. It is rather beside itself with anger, although officials are not saying this publicly," a CBS television correspondent reports from the State Department.

Yet this is not the first time that Tel Aviv has resorted to acts of terrorism. You only have to recall the abduction of the nuclear physicists Mordechai Vanunu, who had to be kept quiet. Or the murder in Tunisia of the Palestinian leader Khalil al-Wazir, all the threads of which led to "Mossad." Or the act of subversion in the Cypriot port of Larnaca on the ship carrying deported Palestinians.

But the terror perpetrated by Tel Aviv has achieved its genuine scope on the occupied Palestinian lands. How many people have already been killed and wounded by the Israeli punitive troops during the suppression of the Palestinian uprising—the intifadah? Hundreds and thousands of Palestinians! It is hard to imagine greater desecration of elementary human rights than when an entire people are the hostages of an aggressive policy.

Terror generates terror and violence generates violence. It is obviously worth recalling this when the United States is examining "a broad list of opinions for retaliatory actions." It is not the escalation of violence but measures to ease the situation, to rule out acts of provocation, which are needed to clear the way to peace.

There is one particular question which the Lebanese press has already put. Who sent Higgins to South Lebanon, uncontrollable and in the grips of anarchy, while the United States was evacuating almost its entire diplomatic personnel and military and civilians even from the peaceful regions of that country? After all, there is no U.S. contingent in the UN temporary forces in Lebanon. Who was deliberately risking Higgins' life?

Politicization of Muslim Hajj Pilgrimage Discussed

NC0108194089 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 30 Jul 89

[Interview with Andrey Krasnov—not further identified—by unidentified announcer, from the feature entitled "Islam and the Contemporary World"; date and place not given]

[Text] [Announcer] For 11 centuries now Muslims throughout the world having been making a pilgrimage to their holy shrines in the first 10 days of the month of Dhu al-Hijjah. This year's Hajj pilgrimage is taking place now. Are there any new developments in this religious ceremony today?

[Krasnov, speaking in Russian, followed by Persian translation] Undoubtedly yes. The Hajj pilgrimage has been, throughout the entire history of Islam, a manifestation of special Islamic unity separate from political considerations. However, today the situation has changed. The Hajj pilgrimage is no longer a mere religious ceremony, but has turned into a venue for acute political confrontations.

In the last decade, there has been unrest on several occasions during the Hajj pilgrimage, and there have been clashes among believers from various Islamic countries. Political differences are becoming, more and more, reasons for serious acts of violence during the Hajj pilgrimage; and these have resulted in deaths and have prevented people from carrying out this ceremony.

[Announcer] [Words indistinct] the bloodiest clashes took place (?2 years ago) in 1987. At that time (?402) pilgrims, most of whom were Iranians, were killed when anti-U.S. demonstrations were being (?carried out). Did this affect the Hajj pilgrimage?

[Krasnov's answer read by announcer] Yes. It did have impacts—fundamental impacts. These tragic events made the Saudi Government review its policy on the Hajj. Last year the Riyadh government approved a law under which the number of pilgrims would be based on the population of each Islamic country. Meanwhile, Saudi Arabia established (?certain quotas), allowing 1,000 pilgrims for each (?1 million) population. According to Riyadh, this is a temporary measure aimed at ensuring the full security of the pilgrims and at making it possible to (?maintain order) in Mecca.

[Announcer] How did the other Islamic countries react to this decision by Saudi Arabia?

[Krasnov's answer, read by announcer] Six months ago, the foreign ministers of 45 Islamic countries met at the Jordan conference and expressed support for Saudi Arabia's decision. Only Iran opposed it, and the Tehran delegation left the talks in protest. Tehran announced that the Saudi Government does not have the right to supervise the holy shrines that belong to the entire world of Islam.

[Announcer] What is your opinion on [words indistinct]? What is the nature of this difference?

[Krasnov, speaking in Russian, followed by translation in Persian] The nature of this difference is that Saudi Arabia strictly bans the use of any kind of political slogan during the Hajj pilgrimage. Iran, in turn, believes that it is necessary and a must to [words indistinct]. For example, some time ago, Iran's officials called on Muslims from various parts of the world to demonstrate during the Hajj pilgrimage with slogans of "Death to America" and "Death to Israel." The Iranian officials also state that Saudi Arabia is preventing the Iranian pilgrims from carrying out their Hajj pilgrimage. However, the Saudi Government rejects these accusations. The Saudi interior minister has stated that Muslims from all over the world, including Iran, are very warmly welcomed in Mecca and Medina. At the same time, during the past 2 years, Saudi officials have refused to grant visas to 150,000 Iranians. As a result, Iran called on Islamic countries to stop cooperating with Saudi Arabia and to form an international Islamic committee for the management of Mecca and Medina. This year too, like last year, Iran boycotted the Hajj pilgrimage and did not send pilgrims to the holy cities.

[Announcer] What kinds of terrorist act have taken place in Mecca?

[Krasnov's answer, read by announcer] Extremists recently caused two bomb explosions near the Ka'ba, as a result of which one person was killed and several were wounded. A hitherto unknown organization calling itself the Generation of Arab Anger telephoned a news agency in West Beirut and assumed responsibility. This organization also threatened the Saudi monarchy. Saudi Arabia did not react to this statement. At the same time, Saudi security forces arrested a number of (?youths) on charges of involvement in this terrorist act.

[Announcer] Did this result in more severe security measures during the Hajj pilgrimage?

[Krasnov's answer, read by announcer] (?Obviously not). This week another explosion took place near the Mecca Congregation Mosque. Reports from Riyadh stated that this explosion was in a non-residential area and that there were no deaths or damages.

[Announcer] What is your opinion? Who is actually behind these explosions?

[Krasnov's answer, read by announcer] Currently, the press in Islamic countries is seriously wondering who benefits from obstructing the Hajj pilgrimage. Iran's religious leader Ayatollah Seyyed 'Ali Khamene'i recently stated that the objective behind these explosions is to prevent the propagation of Muhammad's teachings and to politicize the Hajj pilgrimage.

I think that the special services of Israel and of the United States are involved in these terrorist acts. Whether (?this is true or not) will be proven during (?investigations). However, what is clear is that the intensification of tension around the Hajj pilgrimage and the rift in the world of Islam (?is connected to this), and strengthens the stands of Tel Aviv and of the West.

[Announcer] The last question is: Do Soviet Muslims participate in the Hajj pilgrimage?

[Krasnov, speaking in Russian, followed by Persian translation] Of course. For example, this year a large group of Soviet Muslims went to Mecca. The [word indistinct] of all the four spiritual administrations that unite the Soviet Muslims were among this group. The Soviet Government placed a special plane at the disposal of the pilgrims, and this plane flew them to Saudi Arabia. Today more and more people are seen wearing the green turban in Baku, Tashkent, [name indistinct] and other cities where Muslims live. The Hajj pilgrimage is becoming an inseparable characteristic in the life of Soviet Muslims, who do not only visit the holy shrines in Mecca and Medina. For example, Soviet Shiites have the right to go on pilgrimages to the Shiite shrines. Iran recently announced that it is ready to accept 2,000 Shiites from Soviet Azerbaijan who want to go on a pilgrimage to the

Imam Reza shrine in Mashhad. The Soviet Muslims believe that the Hajj pilgrimage should not become a source of discord and political provocations. The Hajj pilgrimage is one of the columns of Islam, and the etymology of the word is peace.

[Announcer] Thank you very much for your comments.

Conference Still Best Bet for Mideast Peace

PM0108200189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
22 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Konstantin Geyvandov "Political Observer's Opinion": One Step Forward, Four Steps Back"]

[Text] They say that an acute government crisis is developing in Israel, although I am skeptical about this. People also point to the reason for this possibility—maneuvers around the "peace plan," if it can be called that, jointly put forward recently by the partners in the present government coalition, "Likud" and the Labor Party. This "initiative" is based on the proposal to hold elections in Jordan's occupied West Bank and the Gaza Strip in order to form a Palestinian delegation to talk with the Israeli authorities. Essentially this is almost the only point that is more or less clear from the "peace plan" named for Israel's Prime Minister Y. Shamir.

All the rest is either extremely ambiguous, or has an unambiguously anti-Palestinian flavor. Nonetheless, everyone who in one way or another is endeavoring at last to start the peace process in the Near East tried not to reject out of hand the Israeli Government's proposal, hoping to "extract" something positive from it. This applies above all to moderates from the peace camp among the Israeli public itself and to many West European capitals. The U.S. Administration simply welcomed the "Shamir plan," at the same time asking for "explanations" and "clarifications" to be passed on to the PLO leadership in Tunis.

The Israeli Government's proposals did not go unnoticed by the Arab world. Egypt, which as yet is the only Arab country maintaining diplomatic relations with Israel, sent a message to Tel Aviv requesting answers to 10 questions which arose in Cairo regarding the "Shamir plan." Although the PLO leadership rejected the present terms on which the Israelis propose to hold elections, it demonstrated its readiness to continue talks, putting forward, in particular, the idea of making the elections part of the process of a general Near East settlement.

The PLO leadership's position is understandable because, when you look at the Israeli Government's proposal, you keep running into anti-Palestinian obstacles. Despite this, the Tel Aviv hawks rang the alarm bells for all they were worth. The Israeli settlers in the occupied territories expressed their opposition to the cabinet decision, staging another series of anti-Arab provocations. Minister A. Sharon, one of Shamir's main rivals for the leadership in the "Likud" bloc, quickly began to arrange a snub for the prime minister within the party. The extreme right-wing "Tehiya" party went on the warpath, shouting: "Yitzhaq Shamir has laid the foundations of a Palestinian state with its capital in East Jerusalem."

It would be naive to think that the "Shamir plan" itself, in the form in which it was presented, prompted such an sharp reaction from the Israeli hawks. Of course not. Their opposition and resistance was prompted by the potential of what all this could lead to if the Tel Aviv government's proposal resulted in talks. Or, in other words, if the process of a peaceful Near East settlement, which, by all accounts, is long overdue, began. And especially as the talks process would take place against the background of the Palestinians' continuing uprising in the occupied territories.

In any event, under pressure from Sharon's supporters in the "Likud" bloc, its Central Committee made four amendments to the plan for holding elections on Jordan's West Bank and in the Gaza strip. They exclude the Palestinians in occupied East Jerusalem from participating in the elections, reject talks with the PLO and the creation of a Palestinian state, sanction the continuance of the policy of colonizing the occupied territories, and make the termination of the Palestinian uprising a precondition for any talks. One step forward (or rather a small step), and four steps back! Basically, nothing new. But the political bureau of the Labor Party, which is "Likud's" junior partner in the government coalition, took the liberty of arranging a "storm in a teacup" against this background. It declared that it would tell the party Central Committee, whose session is planned for early August, to decide to withdraw its members from Shamir's cabinet.

Why the "storm in a teacup" and whence my feeling that a government crisis in Israel is improbable now? The point is this. The Israeli plan to hold elections in the occupied territories, it seems to me, has a very influential coauthor. This is official Washington, which opposes in every possible way the general desire to call a peace conference on the Near East until, as U.S. Administration spokesmen state every time, the resources of "other promising initiatives" are exhausted. Now the United States, by all accounts, is trying to gamble on the "Shamir plan" and is making efforts to avert a breakdown of the Israeli government coalition with the aim of preserving scope for maneuver around the plan.

And now we are hearing ministers who are members of the Labor Party declare that they are ready to continue to serve in Y. Shamir's government if they receive guarantees that the Israeli "peace initiative" will remain unaltered. U.S. official spokesmen state their conviction that the "Likud" bloc and the Israel Labor Party are nearing an agreement to support the plan for holding elections and to avoid the breakup of their coalition government.

And now a few words about an equally typical phenomenon in today's Israel. While, under pressure from the Palestinian uprising and world public opinion, all these maneuvers, little steps forward and steps back, are proceeding on the surface, polarization is continuing within Israeli society, the dividing line being the same old questions of war and peace. A few days ago the latest issue of the bulletin ANOTHER ISRAEL, which I have followed with interest for several years, arrived in the mail. And I must say that even a fleeting glance at its content convinces me that an Israel which thinks and acts in a completely different way not only continues to exist, but is steadily gathering strength.

I cannot, unfortunately, give a full account of the bulletin's content, on account of the lack of space in the newspaper. But, in my view, even a look at the titles of some of the articles carried in it and at the basic ideas of these articles and reports shows quite convincingly the concerns and worries of that section of the Israeli public whose views are reflected by the publication in question. The bulletin begins with an article entitled "Election Roulette," which contains the following statement: Shamir officially supports the plan named in his honor, but he is hardly going to shed tears if the proposed elections are never held.

The main point of another article is that the development of events caused by the Palestinian uprising in the occupied territories has meant that Israeli public opinion has shifted significantly closer to the positions of the country's peace movement. One report relates that many Israelis were in prison on the latest anniversary of their state's creation because they had demonstrated in support of a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. And an article entitled "The Court's Insult" deals not with condemning, as usually happens, the behavior of the accused, but the reverse, condemning the actions of a judge who, for what would appear to be the same breaches of the law, passes harsh prison sentences on Arabs and virtually acquits Israeli settlers. We are told how one morning this judge saw a sign over his apartment's door: "Here lives a man who issues licenses to kill."

Excerpts from an interview with Professor Ephraim Katzir, who was president of Israel in the late 1970's, complete the bulletin's issue for June-July. The interview was published in full in HADASHOT and contains these noteworthy ideas: Zionists did not dream of a Jewish state in which Arabs are beaten. We dreamed of creating a state of which Jews could be proud: The fact that we are killing Arabs is most depressing... anyone who kills a person other than on the battlefield is harming his mental state; the main problem is that we are not making real efforts to begin talks with the Arabs; if they (the Arabs) believe that we should talk with the PLO, then we should talk with the PLO; you will not find a single person in the occupied territories who does not support the PLO...

In short, it all hinges on the need to begin talks to settle the bloody Arab-Israeli crisis, however difficult, complex, and prolonged they may be. And contrary to the opinion still held by the U.S. Administration, the world public now agrees that an international conference on the Near East would be the most appropriate venue for them.

Gerasimov Cited on Tarasov Visit to Israel

JN2907134589 Abu Dhabi AL-ITTIHAD AL-USBU'I in Arabic 27 Jul 89 p 3

[Text] Moscow, AL-ITTIHAD—The Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs affirmed yesterday that Vladimir Tarasov, deputy Soviet foreign affairs minister for Middle East affairs [name and title as published], has an official, standing invitation to visit Israel. However, no date has been fixed for this visit, the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs added.

The Soviet official spokesman, Gennadiy Gerasimov, informed AL-ITTIHAD yesterday that the materialization of Tarasov's visit will mainly hinge on the development of events and of the Israeli stand vis-a-vis a settlement of the Middle East conflict and the convening of an international peace conference.

Israeli sources said during the past 2 days that the Soviet official is expected to visit Tel Aviv. However, they failed to fix a date for the visit.

Gerasimov told AL-ITTIHAD that Tarasov has recently met with the Syrian, Jordanian, and Egyptian leaders, not to mention his meeting with Palestinian leader Yasir 'Arafat. Gerasimov added that Tarasov also met with Nimrod Novik, Israeli assistant deputy prime minister, in Paris and discussed with him thoroughly the Middle East conflict and the international conference.

Gerasimov went on to say: Tarasov met with the chief of the Israeli consular mission in Moscow 3 days ago at the request of the latter and discussed with him the Arab-Israeli conflict and the prospects for settling the Middle East conflict.

The Soviet official indicated that the officials of consular missions in both Moscow and Tel Aviv are holding a dialogue on the Middle East and the issue of convening an international peace conference as soon as possible.

Informed sources in Moscow interpreted the statements by Gerasimov on the dialogue between officials of the Soviet and Israeli consular missions as an official confirmation of the reopening of consular missions for both sides in both Tel Aviv and Moscow.

East Europe

Kiszczak Named Polish Prime Minister
LD0208095889 Moscow TASS in English 0950 GMT 2 Aug 89

[Text] Warsaw August 2 TASS—The Sejm of the Polish People's Republic appointed today Czeslaw Kiszczak, member of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers by the absolute majority of votes. His candidature was proposed to the Sejm by Polish President Wojciech Jaruzelski.

It was supported by 237 deputies, with 173 voting against and 10 abstentions.

Kiszczak thanked the Sejm for putting confidence in him and asked to give him two weeks for drawing up a program and forming a new government.

Polish Economic Problems, Decision Noted
LD0108121889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0530 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Our Warsaw correspondent, Vladimir Mikhaylenko, reports how the discussion of problems is going at the Sejm session.

[Mikhaylenko] Vitally important questions to Poland are being discussed today in the Senate and Sejm, the problems of its national economy. A tragic situation, some say; a crisis situation, others claim. Public concerns are just the same as with us: here and there matches, [word indistinct] soap, salt, and sugar disappear. Prices are being introduced in local shops which from today will be regulated by free competition: demand and supply and quality of goods. In the opinion of specialists the introduction of market prices is the first real step to solve the food problems. This step will inevitably mean increased prices, which the state intends to compensate for by appropriate financial payments to its citizens. The Sejm is now deciding what these payments will be.

Romanian Papers Publish Ceausescu Interview
PM0108083989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jul 89 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Interview by Spanish Newspaper"]

[Text] Bucharest, 27 Jul—The Romanian press has published an interview given by N. Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, to the Spanish newspaper ABC.

Replying to a question on Romania's socioeconomic development, N. Ceausescu noted that, during the 45 years since the antifascist and anti-imperialist revolution and the social and national liberation, Romania has become an industrial-agrarian country. At present the country is at the stage of building a comprehensively developed socialist society.

Speaking about the concept of a "united Europe," the Romanian leader emphasized that the Socialist Republic of Romania advocates cooperation between all states in the continent on the basis of the principles of equality, respect for independence, and noninterference in internal affairs. We are in favor of cooperation between the EEC and CEMA, but we advocate a Europe of free and independent nations. Only such a Europe will ensure progress for each country and for the continent as a whole.

Touching on the question of development of East-West relations, N. Ceausescu pointed out that all states must display new thinking and new actions. It is time to reject the use of force or the threat of force and the interference in other states' internal affairs.

The leader of the Socialist Republic of Romania expressed confidence that the changes occurring in the socialist countries will impart new dynamism to the development of socialism, and that by the year 2000 socialism will become the promising society for all mankind, a society guaranteeing the solution of problems on the basis of fair principles.

West Europe

Yazov's UK Visit Activities Reported
PM0108153589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Jul 89 First Edition p 1

[Special correspondent V. Markushin dispatch: "Visit Continues"]

[Text] London—In accordance with the program of the official visit to Britain, the Soviet military delegation headed by Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, has visited Leuchars Air Force Base in Scotland and the aircraft carrier "Invincible."

At Leuchars Airbase the high Soviet guests were greeted by Air Marshal K. Kheyr [name as transliterated], chief of staff of the British Air Force Strike Command; Air Vice Marshal V. Retten [name as transliterated], commander of the 11th Air Group; and Colonel A. Begnoll [name as transliterated], commander of the airbase. The Soviet military delegation visited the quarters of the 3d Squadron and inspected Phantom, Jaguar, Buccaneer, Tornado, and Harrier aircraft, the Rapier antiaircraft missile complex, and other combat hardware and equipment. A simulation of an air attack on the airfield and its repulse was shown.

The Soviet guests were taken by air from Leuchars Airbase to the aircraft carrier "Invincible." There the combat potential of the Sea Harrier vertical takeoff and landing aircraft and the Sea King helicopters on board was demonstrated.

In conversation with KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's correspondent Captain M. Gretton [name as transliterated], the aircraft carrier's commander, said that he himself and his subordinates were proud of the honor done to the whole crew when precisely the "Invincible" was selected to be shown to the USSR defense minister. M. Gretton also expressed his satisfaction at the fact that Fleet Admiral V.N. Chernavin, commander in chief of the USSR Navy, was his guest. M. Gretton said that sailors throughout the world, regardless of which flag they serve under, are united by common maritime solidarity.

On 27 July Army General D.T. Yazov familiarized himself with the country's military training institutions.

The 3d day of the visit to Britain by the Soviet military delegation headed by Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, was devoted to familiarization with the organization of the training process at the Paratroop Training Center in Aldershot and at Sandhurst Military Academy. Army General D.T. Yazov was accompanied on the trip by British Defense Secretary G. Younger.

In Aldershot Army General D.T. Yazov and the members of the military delegation—Navy Commander in Chief Flt Adm V.N. Chernavin and Deputy Defense Minister Army General D.S. Sukhorukov—were greeted by General C. Huckstable, commander of ground forces on British territory. He spoke about the structure and tasks of the ground forces, the procedure by which servicemen serve, and their material backup.

Then the delegation members inspected a training center, attended exercises, and talked with personnel. The guests' interest was aroused by a covered training room in which an enemy tank attack and its repulsion by soldiers participating in the exercises were simulated with the help of a hemispherical movie screen, sound effects, and light.

The "Red Devils"—a special group of paratroopers chiefly employed to propagandize this military profession among civilian youth—displayed their skill.

The visit to Sandhurst began with familiarization with the history of this, the oldest training institution for ground forces. Its traditions go back to the 18th century and are fervently honored today.

But traditions are traditions, and training is nonetheless based on the most modern approaches. As Major General P. Graham, the academy's chief, emphasized, today the emphasis is placed on big physical loads, exercises with elements of risk, and strenuous psychological training under conditions approximating to combat conditions.

The academy's good material and technical base makes a considerable contribution to this. The members of the Soviet military delegation were interested to observe exercises in the computer room and also on a distinctive microrange, where nighttime conditions for carrying out small-arms firing exercises were simulated.

It is interesting that the cadet training course also provides for lessons in inculcating such very important skills as the ability to listen to an interlocutor, to ask questions, to generalize information received, and to expound the essence of a matter succinctly. Some 56 hours are allocated to this.

The Soviet guests attended one such demonstration lesson. As an example they listened to a 3-minute report by one of the trainees on... the essence of Soviet perestroyka and glasnost. Without going deeply into the substance of his speech, the ability to expound his idea really was demonstrated: laconism, the ability to hold one's ground, and other qualities essential to the modern officer.

However, the lesson did not end with this but was "continued" by Army General D.T. Yazov. Addressing those present, he again focused their attention on mankind's most urgent task in the nuclear age—the struggle for disarmament and for new, civilized relations among countries and peoples. Modern war, the Soviet minister said, is no mere stroll. It is a catastrophe for everyone. We in the Soviet Union are well aware of this threat and want others to understand it. We would like to believe that the expenditure on learning to fight will ultimately be switched to creative ends, D.T. Yazov said.

In the evening a meeting took place in London between Army General D.T. Yazov, USSR defense minister, and J. Major, the new secretary for foreign and Commonwealth affairs.

Negotiator Views USSR-EEC Cooperation

PM0208085989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Jul 89 First Edition p 3

[Interview with I.D. Ivanov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission, by TASS Political Observer A. Balebanov for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA: "Pooling Europe's Potential: Conversation on Future of USSR-EEC and CEMA-EEC Relations"—date not specified—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The first round of official talks between representatives of the USSR and the EEC has ended in Brussels, during which the sides expressed the desire to work for the conclusion of a wide-scale agreement on cooperation in the sphere of trade and of industrial cooperation, investments, science and technology, and so forth, the first such agreement in the European communities' history. I.D. Ivanov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission, now comments on the results of that meeting for our newspapers' readers.

Balebanov: How would you briefly assess the results of the first round of the talks?

Ivanov: The talks were marked by a search for contacts and paths for cooperation between Europe's two greatest potentials—the communities and the Soviet Union. We managed to agree on the topics and thrust of bilateral cooperation. The elaboration of the precise forms of the agreement will begin during the second round of talks in the Belgian capital in October. Both delegations regard the opening of official talks as a contribution to the process of building the common European home.

Balebanov: What specifically was achieved?

Ivanov: The EC Commission not only accepted all our proposals on specific areas of bilateral cooperation, including the power industry, nuclear power, agriculture, standardization, environmental protection, transport, fishing, and information, but also added such spheres as raw materials production and the mining industry, which were not on our list of proposals.

The two sides managed also to define a mechanism for holding subsequent talks on the elaboration of a basic agreement on USSR-EEC cooperation. It was decided that the agreement will also be, as we say, a "framework" for individual sectors of cooperation. It will say in general terms that the sides will cooperate in, for example, the area of science and technology to achieve particular goals using particular instruments. Then the experts from the competent organs of the EEC and the USSR Council of Ministers Committee on Science and Technology will sit down and work out an individual agreement on specific questions of cooperation. The same applies to other sectors of interaction.

Balebanov: Incidentally, how will the future USSR-EEC agreement affect Soviet institutions' participation in the West European technological cooperation program "Eureka"?

Ivanov: Cooperation with the EEC in the scientific and technical sphere will not prevent us from participating in that program. Opportunities for participation by Soviet institutions and enterprises in the "Eureka" program already exist: They can obtain orders there, conduct research, be paid for that research, and sell the results of their work to those firms and organizations which need scientific and technical studies. But we put the question differently. It is not just a question of fulfilling individual plan orders. We believe that if we take part in a project like "Eureka" its final results will be of interest to us. But there are still stumbling blocks here. I do not rule out the possibility that the question of the USSR's full participation in "Eureka" may appear on a future agenda. But it is more likely that something else will happen—that more active use will be made of the potential offered by the Comprehensive Program for CEMA Countries' Scientific and Technical Progress Through the Year 2000, about 80 percent of whose themes coincide with the "Eureka" program. I see an important channel for cooperation here, therefore.

Balebanov: Will the creation of the single internal market in the EEC not have a negative impact on the USSR?

Ivanov: The creation of a single internal market in the EEC brings to life not only incentives for the development of internal trade but also certain restrictions. It is not impossible that in the initial stage of its operation there will be a temporary decline in the EEC's interest in third countries' markets. Therefore problems will inevitably arise for them. For example, the harmonization of standards will complicate the import of machinery and equipment into the community. But we do not think that the Common Market to be a "fortress of Europe," especially since that market is by no means the whole of Europe, and if agreement is reached on the program which we have proposed that market will not be inaccessible to the USSR. It is my impression that in Brussels there is a desire to conclude a basic agreement with the USSR on cooperation long before the end of 1992 when the EEC single internal market is due to go into operation. We are interested in cooperation with the community and the community members are interested in our market.

When entering into the conclusion of an agreement the Soviet Union works on the assumption that the USSR and individual Common Market countries can still cooperate bilaterally, seek new cooperation opportunities, and conclude agreements beyond the scope of the powers given to the community by the member countries. We shall insist on that condition which, incidentally, appears in the agreement between the EEC and Canada.

Balebanov: Do you not have the impression that the EEC is violating the accords with CEMA in seeking to give priority to the development of relations with individual CEMA countries to the detriment of the parallel development of relations with CEMA as a single entity?

Ivanov: From the very outset we regarded and still do regard the development of USSR-EEC relations and CEMA-EEC relations as parallel processes. These processes were given the green light by the CEMA-EEC joint declaration signed in June last year in Luxembourg. After that declaration became reality the Soviet Union established official contacts with the EEC. We consider that this declaration is only the starting point and must be augmented by an agreement between CEMA and the

European communities which could include those spheres which at present need multilateral solutions in Europe, in particular the ecology, transport, statistics, and so on.

True, in Brussels there are certain attitudes and groups which would like to relegate the development of EEC-CEMA relations to the background. Our country, however, will insist that CEMA is mentioned in a future USSR-EEC agreement.

Balebanov: What is the reaction of other countries, in particular the United States and our CEMA partners, to the prospect of concluding a wide-scale cooperation agreement between the USSR and the EEC?

Ivanov: By entering into negotiations with the EEC, we are not aiming to infringe on the interests of any third countries, least of all the United States, or to limit their position in Western Europe. The Americans have their own tasks in connection with 1992, let them resolve them.

CEMA decisions envisage reciprocal consultations among the member countries regarding the situation at their respective talks with the EEC. The corresponding positions of the CEMA countries at those talks hinge on national interests. We, for example, are a big country with a multisector economy. Thus it is natural that the USSR's range of interests is wider than that of our CEMA partners. But it is not impossible that in time they, too, will want to widen their agreements with the EEC, thereby following our example. I should like to note, however, that if some people think that they will be able to achieve more by themselves at the talks with the EEC than by collective efforts they are mistaken.

UK Air Vice-Marshal Interviewed

PM0108112089 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Aug 89 First Edition p 3

[Interview with British Air Vice Marshal Hunter by Colonel V. Goryainov: "Useful Contacts"; first three paragraphs are KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction]

[Text] In accordance with the treaty on the resumption of contacts through military channels between the USSR and Britain, a delegation from the British Royal Air Force staff college headed by its chief, Air Vice-Marshal F.K. [initials as transliterated] Hunter was in the Soviet Union 23 through 27 July. The delegation was received by Aviation Colonel General A.S. Goryainov, deputy commander in chief of the Air Force for military training establishments. The British guests visited the Air Force engineering academy named for Professor N.Ye. Zhukovskiy, where they were acquainted with the organization of the training of command and engineering cadres for the Soviet Air Force and viewed the material-technical base and the exhibits of the academies' museums and the Air Force museum. Vice-Marshal F.K. Hunter addressed the professorial and teaching staff of the Yu.A. Gagarin Air Force Academy. A display of modern aviation equipment on the ground and in the air was organized for the delegation members at the Kubinka Air Garrison.

Before the delegation left for home our nonstaff correspondent met with Vice-Marshal F.K. Hunter.

[Goryainov] The Soviet Union and Britain have restored contacts through military channels. We see in this a good opportunity for strengthening trust between our peoples and armed forces. What is your assessment of the contacts which have been initiated?

[Hunter] My opinion fully coincides with yours: It is a fine opportunity to improve mutual understanding. I am grateful that we, the members of the staff college delegation, have had the honor to make this first visit. I hope it will open a series of such meetings. We await the arrival in London in November of professors and teachers from the Yu.A. Gagarin Academy. It will be a notable event.

[Goryainov] Military people in the East and the West are often presented as a force which internally resists the process of the reduction of armed forces and armaments and the development of trust between countries. What are the feelings on this score in British circles? Can British military men promote the erosion of the "image of the enemy" in relations between East and West?

[Hunter] In our country, as in yours, the armed forces are to a large degree the executors of the will of the government. And the contribution of the military to decision taking comes down to giving professional advice on professional questions. As a result decisions on questions of international relations, including arms control and disarmament, are taken entirely competently by our governments. And then it is essential to remember NATO's position. That organization considers its function to be deterrence. It must continue to demonstrate that any aggression against NATO will be linked with an unacceptable risk.

[Goryainov] You have had a full program during your stay in the Soviet Union. What impressions have you taken away from this encounter?

[Hunter] I am taking away two impressions. First, the high degree of professionalism and good equipment of the armed forces. Second, the openness and friendliness with which we were received here. I think that such meetings can only benefit the whole world, in which there is a great need for understanding between its different parts. I hope that we will be able to demonstrate the same kindness and openness in our contacts with you.

Turkish Bank Signs for Import Loan to USSR

TA2807184789 Ankara Domestic Service in Turkish 1700 GMT 28 Jul 89

[Text] An agreement for a $150-million Exim Bank import loan to the Soviet Union was signed in Ankara today. Exim Bank Director Turgay Ozkan, who signed the agreement on behalf of his bank, recalled that Soviet markets are beginning to request Turkish goods. Pointing out that the agreement envisions a yearly export figure of $300 million, Ozkan said that in the future more loans will be extended to that country for consumer durable goods.

In turn, Anatoliy Tolkach, director general of the Soviet Bank for Foreign Economic Activity, who signed the agreement, said that his bank expects proposals from Turkey for more substantial and wide-ranging cooperation.

Albert Chernyshev, Soviet ambassador to Ankara, who attended the signing ceremony, said that the volume of trade between the two countries would exceed $1 billion in 1989.

The Soviet Union will use the 4-year loan to buy mostly medicines, leather, industrial detergents, and textile products from Turkey.

USSR, Belgian Experts Investigate MiG Crash

18010842b Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 16 Jul 89 p 3

[Article by V. Golovyashkin, SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA correspondent: "What the 'Black Box' Said"]

[Text] **Work has been completed by a commission of Soviet experts who are in Belgium to investigate the cause of an accident involving a MiG-23 aircraft which crashed in the vicinity of the Belgian city of Kortrijk. It must be said right off that the conclusions reached by the Soviet experts fully coincide with the results of a Belgian commission of civil and military specialists that was working at the same time.**

What happened? Why did the aircraft, abandoned by the pilot, continue uncontrolled flight and, after flying 900 kilometers, crash into one of three separately standing houses? ...A young Belgian man was killed, the house was destroyed, and damage was caused which, as has already been announced, the Soviet side will indemnify.

Objectively controlled data confirmed that a malfunction occurred in the operation of the engine of the MiG-23 immediately after takeoff, and its revolutions dropped to a minimum, which virtually denotes engine cutoff and an emergency situation. Operating strictly according to instructions, the pilot ejected at the permissible altitude limit for this—100 meters.

Then something happened that is inexplicable. Within 6 seconds after the ejection, the engine suddenly began to increase its revolutions, and the aircraft continued flying with a slight increase in altitude in an automatic mode. After a short interval of time, a second brief engine cutoff occurred, and afterwards it resumed operation again. Accurately executing the commands of the perfectly operating automation mechanisms that kept the aircraft on a strict course in a fixed climb, the pilotless aircraft reached the maximum permissible ceiling of 12,000 meters and continued its flight until complete fuel exhaustion. Afterwards, maintaining its former automatic mode, and with an engine that finally stopped, the aircraft began a smooth descent, after which, having lost speed, it fell almost in a flat configuration. All told, 22 minutes transpired from the moment of takeoff to the fall.

And so, the deciphering of the "black box" conducted jointly with the Belgians made it possible to establish a clear picture of what had happened. What has yet to be answered is why was this possible?

In the opinion of Lieutenant General S. Rusanov, head of the Soviet delegation and deputy to commander in chief of the Soviet Air Force, and chief of the flight safety service, total clarity can be achieved only after careful analysis of the aircraft wreckage by specialists of one of the scientific institutes in Moscow concerned with these problems.

The incident evoked and continues to evoke numerous comments in the Belgian press. It is noted, in particular, that the pilotless flight of the MiG is not a unique fact in the history of world aviation. Something like this has also occurred with American and French combat aircraft. It is important that the incident under discussion has prompted an idea that has been around for a long time on the creation of a special mechanism for emergency notices, a kind of "red telephone" direct communications between military organs of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Official announcements already made in this connection confirm the readiness of both sides to take this step.

Officer Interviewed on Crash

18010842A Moscow TRUD in Russian 15 Jul 89 p 3

[Interview with Lieutenant General Ye.A. Rusanov, deputy to the commander in chief of the Soviet Air Force and chief of the Flight Safety Service of the USSR Ministry of Defense, by TRUD correspondent V. Boykoya, Brussels: "Investigation Completed. Details Reported."]

[Text] **Brussels, 14 Jul—Work is being completed by a group of Soviet experts engaged in clarifying the circumstances of a MiG-23 crash that occurred on 4 July in the area of the city of Kortrijk. An examination was made of the place where the aircraft hit and its wreckage, and**

readings of the "black box" were deciphered. What was found out? This is the question our Brussels correspondent, V. Boykoya, asked Lieutenant General Ye.A. Rusanov, chairman of the commission, deputy to the commander in chief of the Soviet Air Force and chief of the flight safety service of the USSR Ministry of Defense.

"I will stipulate immediately," said Ye.A. Rusanov, "that we are talking about preliminary findings. Objective control data, that is, the 'black box' have confirmed: Actually, engine failure occurred at takeoff of this MiG-23. Being in an emergency situation, the pilot acted according to the manual on flight operations and abandoned the malfunctioning aircraft. Today we now know what happened, but we still do not know why. To finally understand the reasons for what happened, and there are many versions, we will still have to work with the aircraft wreckage in Moscow, in a special institute."

[Boykoya] Can you tell us, on the basis of the deciphered data, how this ill-fated flight occurred?

[Rusanov] After takeoff, the aircraft gained altitude. At a height of about 100 meters from the ground, its afterburner turned off, engine revolutions dropped, as we say, to lower than idle revs. That is, the engine almost shut off. And this was at a very low altitude. In other words, both the pilot and the aircraft were in an emergency accident situation. At 41 seconds of flight, the pilot ejected himself. Within approximately 6 seconds after this the revolutions of the engine started to increase again. Soon, however, a second malfunction occurred, similar to the first. Afterwards the operation of the engine stabilized. Owing to the autopilot system, which maintains heading and bank, the aircraft continued to gain altitude. After reaching about 12,000 meters, it continued its flight on automatic pilot controls.

After the fuel was completely used up, the engine stopped. Still under automatic control, the aircraft began to descend. From an altitude of about 300 meters it fell at slow speed in a flat configuration. If the aircraft had flown at least another 10-15 meters, it would have crashed into a vacant lot, and this would have spared one person's life and the destruction of his home.

[Boykoya] How long did the flight last?

[Rusanov] 1 hour 22 minutes.

[Boykoya] What caused the engine malfunctions?

[Rusanov] As I have already indicated, for the time being we cannot answer this question. Further analysis is necessary.

[Boykoya] How did the Belgian side react to your preliminary findings?

[Rusanov] We were able to arrive at a mutual understanding both at meetings, which were participated in by representatives of the Belgian MFA [ministry of foreign affairs] and the ministries of defense, justice, and internal affairs, and during the course of the investigation. We coordinated our document on the investigation of this incident with local experts, and they coordinated theirs with us. The documents are practically identical in content and conclusions. I think that there is no place now for such questions as: Was this flight not "contrived" to check on the operation of NATO's PVO [Air Defense], or was it not some other kind of a provocation? Belgian specialists, who took part in all phases of our investigation, including deciphering the "black box," were able to ascertain this directly and personally.

[Boykoya] Many local specialists and journalists asked the question: Why was not the uncontrolled MiG intercepted by Warsaw Pact PVO systems?

[Rusanov] This question has to be answered by another commission which is investigating this side of the matter as well. So, let us be patient and wait for its findings.

[Boykoya] Then why, in your opinion, was the MiG-23 not shot down by American pilots who escorted it in the flight over the FRG, Holland, and Belgium. The official version is known: They hoped that it would head out to sea and were afraid to shoot it down over heavily populated territory. But were there really no unpopulated areas along the flight path?

[Rusanov] Do not forget that the MiG was flying at an altitude of 12,000 meters. The pilots could not calculate where the pieces of the aircraft would fall at that altitude. The dispersion trajectory could not be predicted by them.

[Boykoya] What difficulties did your mission encounter in Belgium?

[Rusanov] We found a common language with the local authorities rather quickly, and our cooperation was successful. The main "hitch" arose on the part of the prosecuting attorney of the city of Kortrijk. He sequestered the aircraft wreckage until we show the reason for this accident and confirm it with factual evidence. But we cannot do this without conducting appropriate analyses of the fragments in our country. We prepared appropriate documents for the prosecuting attorney with an explanation of the substance of the affair. After familiarizing himself with them, he released the MiG fragments today, which will be loaded onto our transport aircraft tomorrow and flown to the USSR. We once again reaffirmed for the prosecuting attorney the readiness of the Soviet side to make restitution for the damage that was caused, whose amount the Belgian side is now determining.

[Boykoya] And the last question. Belgian Minister of National Defense F. Coeme raised the question about the creation of a NATO and Warsaw Pact treaty on "crisis centers," which would be called on to inform each other in a timely fashion of similar incidents? What do you think about this?

[Rusanov] A notification mechanism concerning such accidents, unquestionably, is needed. We and the Belgians, and many others, have come out for its establishment. Now it is necessary to put the idea into effect. And the faster it is put into effect, the better it will be for all of us.

Latin America & Caribbean

Castro Delivers Moncada Anniversary Speech

PM0108084989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jul 89 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Continuity in the Cause of the Fighters"]

[Text] Havana, 27 Jul—Cuba's leader Fidel Castro spoke Wednesday at a rally to mark the Day of the National Uprising—the 36th anniversary of the storming of Moncada Barracks. This year's festivities were held in the administrative center of Camaguey Province.

F. Castro noted that great changes have taken place in the 30 years of revolution on the territory of this eastern province, which until 1959 was considered to be a "rural backwater." Camaguey's sugar plants, chemical industry enterprises, plants for the production of mineral fertilizers, factories for the manufacture of construction materials, and food industry enterprises are making a major contribution to the national economy's development.

Touching upon questions of international politics, the speaker stated that a special situation prevails in the world revolutionary movement, brought about in particular by difficulties in the socialist community countries. He noted in this context that Cuba primarily upholds every country's and every party's right to be independent.

In the last few days, the Cuban leader declared, we have received a warm fraternal message which was sent on behalf of the Soviet people by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers on the occasion of Cuba's national holiday. We have friendly feelings for the Soviet Union and sincerely wish the people of the Land of the Soviet to overcome the existing domestic difficulties, to consolidate their unity, and to keep up and consolidate the role they played in the world arena.

The leader of the Cuban revolution declared that, in the face of imperialism which still pursues a hardline course toward the republic, the people of the Island of Freedom are ready to repulse any aggressive actions. We know how to fight in any conditions, even if a total blockade were to be introduced. The Cuban people will always stand in the front ranks of the fighters for independence and progress, F. Castro emphasized.

Castro Notes 'Difficulties' of Socialism

LD0108121189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" Newscast]

[Text] Fidel Castro, Cuba's leader, has spoken at a solemn meeting marking the day of the national rising, the 36th anniversary of the storming of the Moncada barracks. Dealing with issues of international policy, he stated that a special situation had arisen in the world revolutionary movement brought about in particular by difficulties in the countries of the socialist community. In this connection he noted that Cuba first and foremost defends the right of every country and every party to independence. [video shows Castro speaking]

Cuban Officers' Arrest Reported

PM0208155989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Aug 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Against Corruption and Lawlessness"]

[Text] Havana, 1 Aug—There has been an official announcement here of the arrest of former Cuban Interior Minister Division General Jose Abrantes Fernandez and a group of other former staffers of the same ministry, including Brigade General Roberto Gonzalez Caso, former chief of the immigration service, Oscar Carreno Gomez, former leader of the main customs directorate; and Lieutenant Colonel Rolando Castaneda Izquierdo. Those arrested also include Hector Carbonell Mendez, former director of a currency operations enterprise which for many years was closely linked with the Cuban Interior Ministry.

The report published on Monday by the newspaper GRANMA stresses that in the process of the changes taking place in the Interior Ministry leadership here obvious evidence has emerged of serious omissions and violations of the law, the main responsibility for which rests with the top leadership of that ministry.

The report indicates that the leadership of the Communist Party of Cuba has been obliged to take the decision to arrest Jose Abrantes Fernandez in connection with the need to eradicate all negative trends and actions which run counter to the principles and laws of Cuban society. Among these trends and actions it highlights dereliction of duty, corruption and conniving with corruption, squandering state funds and their misappropriations, the manipulation and concealment of information important to the state, the creation of illegal enterprises in the field of foreign commercial activity, nepotism, and other violations.

Within the framework of the process of restructuring work and rectify the errors committed and eliminating negative trends in the Ministry of the Interior, GRANMA's report says, Brigade Generals Arsenio Franco Villanueva, Amado Valdes Gonzalez, Felix Veliz Hernandez, Miguel Bermejo Labrada, and Manuel Suarez Alvarez (Chomon) have been demoted to the rank of colonel and released into the reserve.

Castro's Political Style, Tactics Profiled

18070442 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 26 Jul 89 p 5

[Article by Pavel Bogomolov, vice president of the USSR-Latin America Association of Friendship and Cultural Ties: "The Leader of the Nation"]

[Text] **As early as the fifties, when the Cuban rebels were enthusiastically called "Barbudos" (bearded ones), Fidel Castro was first to come to mind. He was the one who on 26 July 1953 led the patriots to storm the barracks at Moncada. He is the one who has been at the helm of revolutionary Cuba to this day, when the country celebrates that date as a national holiday.**

...How does one explain the "magnetism," which has lasted for decades, of Fidel Castro's personality? While working in Havana for 6 and ½ years I constantly asked myself that question. At first the answer sounded traditional: the rare gift of political foresight, outstanding organizational abilities, immense talent as a speaker, exceptional erudition, the closest ties with the party aktiv and the masses of people...

But among these traditional traits there flickered a new one: The power of the fascinating Fidel, the secret of his popularity is largely explained by the fact that the decisions he makes could not be precisely predicted beforehand. And this is a real fact that has been corroborated dozens of times.

...24 December 1956. A sad Christmas with no bells ringing, at the highest geographical point in Cuba—the peak of Turquino. Of the 80 rebels who arrived in Cuba on the yacht Granma, only 12 have gathered here. They have reached the end of their strength. Nobody has more than ten cartridges left. And they are being pursued from behind. And suddenly through the despair and hopelessness the strong voice of Fidel was heard:

"We have already won the war. Batista has been defeated."

The amazed troops looked around in disbelief. Even old friends of the commander thought for a moment that this time Fidel was at the very least exaggerating. But, after pausing, he began to present his conclusions. And literally within a half hour he was able to convince everyone that he was right. In the complicated situation at that time Fidel felt the beginning of the end of the Batista regime.

...Having barely entered Havana in 1959 the rebel army unexpectedly began to carry out Fidel's decree concerning...a merciless war against the mafia. Many assumed that it would be necessary to begin by suppressing the military opposition or expropriating the property of the cattle barons. The battle against the all-powerful North American Cosa Nostra, which had extended its power to the hotels, gambling houses, and health resorts of Cuba, seemed doomed to defeat. Only later was it fully recognized that any revolutionary transformations would be blocked under the conditions of driving out organized crime.

...The 1970's. At a time of a fairly serious financial crisis the Cuban leadership headed by Fidel made an unprecedented decision to purchase thousands of highly productive holstein cows from Canada and...have them delivered by airplane. This was a necessary step, as a result of which the holsteins crossed with the local zebu began annually to produce a half liter of milk for every Cuban child. And a number of epidemics immediately disappeared. They finally managed to break the vicious circle of avitaminosis inherited from prerevolutionary times when only 12 percent of Cubans had ever tasted milk products.

"The unexpectedness of bold political improvisations"—this is how they responded in the West to these and many other pages of recent Cuban history. I would add—the predictable unexpectedness to which it is time to become accustomed. Incidentally, it is as though the very biography of Fidel Castro cancels out everything that was in store for this person by virtue of his origin, rearing, and education.

Fidel Castro was born on 13 August 1926 to the family of a Spanish emigrant who was closely associated with the American companies of a plantation owner. He was graduated with distinction from a Catholic school and the Havana Jesuit college Belen. The young man had a brilliant future. But the heir to plantations and other real estate became a professional revolutionary. Having entered the law school at the university in the capital in 1945, 2 years later he was participating in the preparations for an expedition to the Dominican Republic to fight against Trujillo's tyranny. The participants in the landing party, who were prepared for departure, were surrounded by the police. Fidel dove into the water and swam around the bay, escaping arrest.

In April 1948 he was in the Columbian capital among the ranks of those who were demonstrating against Washington's dictatorship—participants in the renowned "Bogotaso."

Four years later the young Havana lawyer F. Castro, a candidate for membership in the house of representatives of the congress, was the first to condemn the Batista insurrection and its goals and methods.

In July 1953 a group of young revolutionaries headed by Fidel fearlessly stormed the barracks at Moncada—the stronghold of Batista tyranny in the eastern part of the country. The court judging the patriots who were still alive ended up, because of F. Castro's oratory, as a court of justice for the dictatorship itself.

All the subsequent events in Cuban history are linked to the name of Fidel Castro. A not very well known university graduate became a national leader, an eminent activist in the nonalignment movement, and an international class politician. And all this in spite of the small size and limited possibilities of his country.

The fate of socialist Cuba, as has been noted repeatedly, is much different from the fates of the majority of states of our community. And here is one of the main peculiarities: The stages of the republic's development change while the basic nucleus of the Cuban leadership headed by Fidel remains unchanged. And this is probably because F. Castro and his advisers promptly take note of their mistakes, analyze them, and rectify them. Relying on the Leninist legacy, the Cuban leader, quite in keeping with his principles, once announced that the party's maturity is determined by its attitude toward its own mistakes...

The year is 1970. The gigantic sugar cane harvest which was supposed to bring the country 10 million tons of raw sugar ends in failure. The republic is experiencing a shortage of what it most needs. If stubborn, self-important, and inert people had been in the position of Fidel and the other Cuban leaders they would have tried to extricate themselves from the crisis by a path that had already been tried: another outburst of revolutionary enthusiasm, emergency organizational measures, and more and larger mobilizations to the work front.

But this would have led the republic into an even more dangerous blind alley, as they correctly decided in Havana. On Fidel's initiative and in spite of initiative from dogmatists, the steering wheel of party and state leadership turned sharply in the other direction. In Cuba there was a restoration of such terms as "labor productivity," "profitability," "profit," and "differentiated payment."

But the new path was not without stumbling stones either. Against the background of accelerated economic growth such distorted phenomena as open pressure, corruption, deception, and official abuse turned up. Fidel and the other Cuban leaders spoke out resolutely against carrying things too far again.

In 1986 a new stage began in the history of Cuba—the process of rectification of mistakes and elimination of negative tendencies. Although this process is complicated, it is interesting and promising, a symbol of renewal before our very eyes.

The Soviet-Cuban summit meeting in Havana was probably remarkable in that M.S. Gorbachev and F. Castro have something in common these days, saturated as they are with the most important events. For although it is contradictory, very valuable experience has been accumulated in social renewal, which is directed toward making sure that the world of socialism enters the new millennium not only unified and powerful but also essentially dynamic, humane, and deeply creative. "We believe in Lenin's great homeland," proclaimed Fidel Castro from the podium of the 27th CPSU Congress. The Soviet people, in turn, believe in Cuba, the first country in the Western Hemisphere to choose the socialist path of development.

Ortega Receives Support for Contra Stand

LD0108094689 Moscow TASS in English 0754 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Managua August 1 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Pshenichnikov:

The Honduran Government intends to hamper the demobilisation of Contra gangs deployed on the territory of that country. At a meeting of presidents of Central American countries due to be held on August 5-7 Honduras plans to submit a document suggesting that the disbandment of anti-Sandinista armed groups be postponed until February 1990 despite the fact that, according to agreements signed in El Salvador, the demobilisation of the Contras should have been started two months ago, Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega has said.

He said that Honduras was taking this step under the influence of the United States which is trying to preserve the Contras as an instrument of pressure on the Sandinista government. The U.S. Administration regards the existence of counterrevolutionary gangs as a "guarantee of honest and democratic elections" on February 25, 1990. Ortega described Washington's stand as blackmail, as a gross violation of the standards of international law and interference in the internal affairs of Nicaragua.

Local political observers believe that the coming summit in the city of Tela, Honduras, will witness a confrontation between Nicaragua, on the one hand, and Honduras and El Salvador, on the other. It is known already that President Alfredo Cristiani of El Salvador will support the proposal of Honduras to postpone the disbandment of the Contra gangs. Moreover, the Salvadoran military are preparing their own manoeuver which will consist in linking consideration of the disarmament of the Contras and of the rebel detachments in El Salvador. These countries will try to block the adoption of any document covering a final and unconditional disbandment of the anti-Sandinista armed groups.

Nicaragua's official representatives have already stated that Nicaragua resolutely opposes the linking of two problems—the disarmament of the Contra gangs and the civil war in El Salvador. Costa Rica is siding with Nicaragua on this matter. President Oscar Arias of Costa Rica told TASS in San Jose recently that the disarmament of the Contras and the termination of bloodshed in El Salvador should be analysed separately.

Political & Social

Supreme Soviet on Pensions, Nuclear Moratorium

Gorbachev Addresses Supreme Soviet

LD0108145489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1103 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Speech by President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to the Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 1 August—recorded]

[Text] First of all, I would like to say this: The point of departure in all our international affairs is the new political thinking and the new foundations of the foreign political course of the Soviet state. Now they have been ratified by the Congress of People's Deputies and have acquired the force of law. They have become a component of the decision adopted by the congress. You will, of course, agree that there exists an indissoluble link between the new foreign policy and the perestroyka within the country. Our entire activity in the international arena is built on this principle; it is vital to us.

You have undoubtedly noticed that during the election campaign and at the congress itself, our international policy received support; even though, I have to say, it was not the subject of broad discussion.

Our natural absorption with domestic problems should not, all the same, shadow the significance of foreign policy for finding a successful solution to these same domestic problems. After all, the result of this policy is not only the reduction of the threat of war and the strengthening of external security, not only a perception abroad of the Soviet state that meets our future interests. The result is also better conditions for the implementation of our domestic plans, first and foremost, and for the adoption of the kind of decisions in the economy, the social sphere, culture and ideology that will allow society to move both faster and more reliably along the path of perestroyka. In general, we now need, perhaps more than ever before, favorable external conditions so that we can cope with the revolutionary and broad tasks toward renewing Soviet society.

Thus, a community of vital interests of the whole Soviet people is concentrated in foreign policy, and this sphere of politics also requires the constant attention of all our state bodies, of our whole public and our whole people. It must be undertaken in a thorough way; this demands considerable efforts. Not infrequently one hears and even reads about people asking if this is excessive, asking if there is too much time and effort being devoted to foreign political affairs. I think, comrade deputies, that it is impossible to economize in this area of policy, and all the more so to set up domestic and foreign policy in opposition to each other. [as heard] Of course we are gripped by the stream of everyday concerns, and the acuteness of the situation in which we find ourselves the whole time does have an effect upon us. Nevertheless, we must not lose sight of the importance of international activity for the same policy of perestroyka within the country. And if there are those who can still allow themselves to remain aloof from the world process in the name of old dogmas, the Soviet Union is not one of them. The country would inevitably be doomed to lag behind in science and technology, to lag behind in its economy and in the level of the well-being of the people. We are not going to be able to solve our domestic tasks that have gathered to a head and in a number of cases have gone further. We would lose the prospect of maintaining our world role, and that is not just a question of prestige. Our place in world development and in the progress of the whole of mankind is brought about historically. The changeover to the civilization of the 21st century will be impossible if the USSR remains the same as it was for many a long decade and if perestroyka does not take place. The impetus, therefore, comes not just from our domestic requirements but also from the changing world in which you and I actually live.

It is precisely in such a context that we must consider our international policy, including the recent visits to three major European states and the meeting in Bucharest with our own socialist allies. I would like to say once again that information about all these international events has been in the press and I hope that anyone who has wanted to has familiarized himself with it. I proceed simply from the fact that this releases me from the need to set out what is contained in it and especially to keep to some kind of chronology of events and go into the details.

The main thing on which I want to concentrate is assessments and conclusions and also some of the most important impressions of these trips and meetings.

Concerning my visits to Great Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, and France, all of them number among the most major powers in the modern world in economic, political, and military terms. Two are nuclear powers and are permanent members of the UN Security Council. NATO has an enormous nuclear and non-nuclear potential concentrated in the FRG. All of their roles in shaping European and world politics is enormous.

The visits took place at a very crucial time, one might say a turning point in world development and a time of profound transformations in the socialist world. They took place against a background of important political processes connected with the final document adopted in Vienna in January, with the talks on conventional weapons and armed forces in Europe, which have started and with the renewal of the foreign policy activity of the U.S. Administration, and accordingly NATO, after a certain pause.

Here is another circumstance which explains the significance of these visits at the precise time at which they took place. Western Europe is now moving more quickly toward awareness of the need for mutual understanding and cooperation with us. It is ready to discuss any problems, taking into consideration the realities and the balance of interests and to overcome confrontational approaches.

The talks with the leadership of Great Britain, the FRG, and France and the meetings with the public and with average citizens have strengthened us in the opinion that Europe now is completely different than what it was just a few years ago.

Comparing my current contacts with previous ones which took place at the same level in the recent past, I sense how quickly our relations with the Western world are changing.

There is greater confidence, greater willingness to trust, even greater definition, greater confidence in a future Europe of peace, greater openness, and—the main thing—the content of relations is getting deeper. We were able to convince ourselves of this in London, everywhere in the Federal Republic of Germany, in Paris, in Strasbourg, where, one may put it like this, all Western Europe was represented. The simple fact that with each year we get to know each other better also had an effect upon the character of the meetings. As is now clear to everyone, the personality element is of enormous importance for current politics. In all three capitals, it is now accepted as an essential element in the European process. The new quality of summit meetings and meetings at the political level in general is, of course, not identical from one country to another, but nowhere are things rolling backward. The mood of the public exerted an enormous influence upon the character of the visits. Here I could even use our own usual term, the broad masses, but this time, as they say, without any self-deception. One could not fail to be gratified by the reception we were given by the citizens of all three countries. The behavior of people and the ways in which they expressed their feelings naturally had nuances from one city to another. But everywhere, and especially in the FRG, the impression arose that evidently it is a question of this barrier, which has divided us for a long period of years, having apparently collapsed. Interest and affection, well-wishing attitudes, the widest range of feelings, the only feelings missing being hostility and enmity. That is the impression I would like to convey to you—of itself it outweighs the importance of many of the political decisions and signed agreements. We felt the whole immensity of the potential for good-neighborliness, which really is capable of ensuring a sharp turning point in history, and not just that of Europe.

All of this is linked with a growing understanding of the international significance of our perestroyka. The elections and the Congress of People's Deputies and the first session of the new Supreme Soviet—the work of which has taken place and is taking place now in the Kremlin—have had a strong influence upon the way our country is perceived abroad. This work convinces even skeptics of the depth and the scale of the changes taking place in our country and of the seriousness and constructiveness of our intentions and our affairs. We felt that the heightened, to put it directly, mass attention now being shown to us in the world is not an idle matter; it is not an idle matter.

It is a recognition of the fact that without a prosperous Soviet Union the present world would not be complete. Another reason has an effect here. The general feeling that nuclear war is moving into the past is very strong in Europe now. The hope that arose some time ago is being turned into confidence that the world can be saved, that normal, civilized relations between the countries of East and West are possible. The release from the oppressive consciousness of the constant threat of war is put down primarily to us and is linked with Soviet perestroyka and the new thinking.

In short, we have seen for ourselves the results of the major turnaround in public international consciousness. It made itself strongly felt during our visits. This is an extraordinarily important factor in the current world process. The main subjects of the political dialogue and the talks in all three capitals were the state of the current world and prospects for the resolution of global problems, including international economic [mezhkhozyavstvennye] and regional ones, security and disarmament, all-European construction, and bilateral relations under conditions of perestroyka in the USSR. The same range of problems was present in the contacts with the scientists, too, with the business circles and the public. It is natural that all of these questions, as in life itself, were examined in conjunction with each other. I have to say that at the philosophical level we discovered a large degree of understanding of our analysis and our thinking. That, we believe, reflects the objective situation, the growing integrity of the current world and the common nature of the destinies of Europe and mankind. With all the peculiarities of views and assessments, I think that it is possible to declare a similarity on conceptual issues with a direct relevance to world policy such as the following: the unacceptability and absurdity of the military solution of problems and contradictions between states; the primacy of values common to the whole of mankind; the freedom of choice; the lowering of the armaments level and the elimination of military confrontation; the need for the economic adaptation of East and West; and the internationalization of efforts.

The same range of problems was also present in contacts with scientists, business circles, and the public. Naturally all these issues were examined as interlinked, as they are in life itself. I must say that on the philosophical level we discovered a large degree of understanding for our analysis, our thoughts. As we see it, this reflects the objective situation, the growing integrity of the modern world, and the common nature of the destinies of Europe and mankind. Given all the special features of the views and assessments one can, I think, observe similarity on such conceptual issues which have a direct bearing on world politics: the unacceptable nature and absurdity of resolving problems and contradictions between states by military means; the preeminence of general human values; freedom of choice; reducing the level of weapons and eliminating military confrontation; the need for economic adaption by East and West; and for the internationalization of efforts in the ecological area; politics and morality; the role of the humanitarian and cultural factor in the political process; the significance of direct contacts between citizens of various states.

The very composition of the problems being discussed and the level of mutual understanding which is being discovered in the process indicate that the new thinking is beating a path into international politics for itself. That is not just philosophy but real politics.

In this sense, the joint statement signed in Bonn is of fundamental significance. Basically that is, in essence, the first document in which two major European states belonging to different systems and different alliances have jointly outlined the aims of their policy on the basis of a philosophical interpretation of the changes in the world. This document is a landmark in that, in expressing the will of the peoples of both countries, it draws a line under the post-war period in the difficult history of their relations and envisions long, multi-leveled cooperation on the basis of trust, equality of rights, and mutual advantage.

As for the differences at the talks in London, Bonn, and Paris they lie primarily in the question of the role of nuclear weapons, although we can see the nuances in their positions and arguments. For the British leadership, you know, nuclear deterrence is akin to some sort of even obsessive idea. The FRG is concerned about the position of the country on the line of nuclear confrontation and especially about the danger for it from any nuclear weapon. France defends its specific position in the Atlantic alliance and the exclusively political purpose of its nuclear potential.

They all talk about their obligations as members of an alliance. We are opposed to the policy of nuclear deterrence, which is capable of reducing the value of reductions in conventional weapons and runs counter to the task of eliminating military confontation in Europe, against which it seems in general there is no objection.

To bring into play additional opportunities for finding outcomes at the Vienna talks we gave concrete expression to our idea of doing things in stages [poetapnost] and reinforced it with our readiness to unilaterally make further reductions in our missiles in Europe if it is obvious that NATO countries are going to decide to enter talks on tactical nuclear weapons with us.

In this regard I want to react to a question which sometimes arises among Soviet people and some people ask it straight out, as the saying goes: Are we not going too far, are we not making impermissible concessions? I must say with all conviction, relying on Lenin's lessons, that access toward a period of peace and normal international relations lies only in sensible compromise. For this to be the world community, as we believe, and experience backs us up in this assessment, the community has matured. It is already able, I would perhaps put it even more strongly, it is destined to renounce such a concept of the enemy image. So, when we hear allusions from a completely different era and from a different field referring to praise on the part of an enemy, we can only say, unfortunately, that a person who thinks like that after 4 years of perestroyka has understood nothing and learned nothing. It would be an oversimplification to ignore the fact that the West, too, is meeting us halfway in disarmament issues: the generally accepted historical importance of the INF Treaty, which is being put into practice honestly; the United States has not increased its military budget in the past 3 years, and Congress has now begun to fight about that. A considerable number of nuclear warheads have been withdrawn from Europe; a moratorium has been declared on the production of weapons-quality plutonium and tritium; the tank production program has been cut; the destruction of the Pershing-1A missiles belonging to the FRG has been completed. The response from President Bush and NATO to our proposal for cutting conventional weapons in Europe brings closer and does not move away a solution to the problem. The second round of the Vienna talks on these matters, which has just ended, concluded, one might say, with a plus. On convergent courses, we succeeded in bringing considerably closer a solution to the issue of banning chemical weapons.

These are all very important things. They must not be underestimated. Of course, U.S. and NATO military and political activities are not confined to that. We are well able to see other aspects of this activity, aspects that are dangerous for the world [mir]. Suffice to recall some of the stances proclaimed in NATO's Brussels declaration. Nevertheless, the processes under way do include new qualities, new opportunities, and new demands for the mutual relations between the two worlds. The large-scale and, I would say, comprehensive and very substantial discussions held during the visits on the problems of building Europe also bear witness to that. A positive attitude toward the idea of a common European home is established in the joint Soviet-West German statement, in the words of President Francois Mitterrand, and in the constructive reaction to our speech in Strasbourg.

The possibilities and productiveness of the dialogue on European problems expand generally in keeping with the growing understanding of the unacceptability and danger for the West itself of attempts to destabilize the situation in the socialist states, taking advantage of the stormy reform processes taking place in these countries. I also have to say, and the discussions in the course of the visit confirm this, that in the West an ever-growing number of people are beginning to understand that the success of our perestroyka is not the capitalist regeneration of Soviet society. They are beginning to understand that we have pursued and will continue to pursue perestroyka on the basis of our values, resolving the tasks of the renewal of socialism. In Strasbourg, it was said for the whole world to hear that the world community, in the event of perestroyka succeeding, will be dealing with a new socialist state, a new one I stress, but precisely a socialist one. This, by all accounts, is perceived in the West with ever greater understanding. There is less speculation on this account. This does not come easy. It is not easy for many to come to terms with such a conclusion. But international public opinion is maturing precisely in this direction. I think that as a result of the visits one can talk of a rapprochement of concepts of the European home, and of the fact that the reality of this idea has become more obvious. It is at present perhaps still impossible to fully assess the significance of our visit to Strasbourg. This was, to put it figuratively, a visit to western Europe, in the integrity which it has achieved at the present moment. Strasbourg is one of the capitals of Western European integration, which has encompassed not only the economic, but also the political, parliamentary legal, cultural, and other spheres. With my speech there, before the parliamentary assembly of the Council of Europe, a dialogue, as it were, began at summit level. The speech was given in the most representative organization; it unites 23 countries and is the oldest Western European political organization. In May, it celebrated its 40th anniversary.

Moreover, Strasbourg is where the European Parliament of twelve countries is based, the members of which were also invited to the meeting. I admit that the reception we were given there, the response to our ideas that was expressed in speeches and in conversations, and the desire to discuss with us, in a practical way, the problems of European construction, all this was, to a certain extent, even unexpected for our delegation. So, we can state with satisfaction that in Strasbourg we gained convincing confirmation of the vitality and promising nature of the common European process.

Its council could become one of the supporting structures of the common European home, and the venue for the joint studying of important problems, initiatives. We have to thoroughly study not only the declaration that was entrusted to us, but also the Council of Europe's conceptions of culture, education, ecology, television and other issues, and to decide to which ones we could subscribe. Of course, the time has come to set up permanent Supreme Soviet links both with the Council of Europe and with the European Parliament, all the more so since invitations have been made on their side.

In connection with European affairs, the parties we conversed with inquired, on several occasions and deeply, about Soviet-U.S. relations. Our standpoint here is absolutely definite. It is based, like everything else, on political realism. The United States of America is objectively a factor in the European process. It would be primitive, what is more, I will be frank, it would be pointless to underestimate this reality, let alone to build plans of some kind. Therefore, in our interests and in the interests of all, relations with that country should be built in such a way that they promote the adaption of East and West on the path toward a new, peaceful European order. They should strengthen the security of each and every country in conditions of the realization of their inalienable right to social and economic choice.

We judge the recent visit by President Bush to Poland and Hungary by the same criteria—a natural thing. However, on the understanding that the temptation to make use, as I have already said, of the complex processes of transformation in countries with a different system, designed to sweep them from their chosen path, is controlled. Such a thing would have certain negative consequences for all of Europe.

During the visit we once again were aware of the Europeans' interest in further improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations, and first and foremost, in success at the talks on a 50-percent cut in strategic nuclear weapons. In all seriousness we received the opinions of those we were talking to on that matter on the principle of interests coinciding with our own.

Permit me now to draw certain practical conclusions on the results of the visits to these three major European states. First, I will discuss the economic aspect of the matter. As a result of the summit meetings and other talks in Great Britain, the FRG, and France, a probably unprecedented amount of work on mutually beneficial cooperation was done. A record number of agreements were signed: 12 in Bonn and 22 in Paris. Of course, it is not the quantity that is important, but that also tells you something. It is also important that there were talks with the most authoritative representatives of the business world who, in our impression, were attuned, even though critically, to our present foreign economic potential and were constructive, inclined to take the long view, in the long term, and ready, with a businessman's inherent pragmatism and determination, jointly to seek out the most acceptable forms of cooperation.

Incidentally, I also had to listen to complaints during these meetings, complaints of slowness and of pure red tape on the part of certain Soviet departments. It turned out that the criticism was often justified, when we inquired specifically and objectively into these matters.

Taking this into account and considering the importance to us of an immediate solution to the problems which exist here, the relevant Supreme Soviet committees and the commissions of the chambers must in one way or another get down to this matter.

The predominant part of the agreements which were concluded relate to the scientific and the scientific-technological fields. The task is to help the economic reform through implementing them, for practical incentives to be formed for the development of direct economic ties, including small and intermediate firms, for the establishment of effective functioning of joint enterprises producing output which is vitally necessary for our consumer. Cooperation with French films is envisioned in the agro-industrial complex and in forestry. Light industry is to be modernized with the participation of firms from the FRG and Italy. Possibilities are opening up for cooperation in such advanced areas as heavy space platforms, aviation construction, rapid railway transport, telecommunications, future generation televisions, and so on. We expect a great deal of the establishment here in Leningrad and in the FRG of Economics and Industry Houses. In short, it is a kind of paradox that it seemed formerly that the biggest obstacle lay in wait for us in implementing our new international policy in the area of human rights and arms reduction. Things in the economic field appeared to be more simple and more habitual. Now, comrades, it would seem that things look entirely the other way around.

Let us be frank; the difficulties here are not only connected with the barriers raised by the West—these exist, they still remain—but also with out inertia, with the lag in our restructuring and economic thought. Let me put it plainly: Difficulties also exist with the inability to work on the world market, with incompetence and prejudice, and sometimes simply with laziness.

I have to say that when we asked for the embassies' opinion about the work of our delegations in the last couple of years, the embassies' assessments are very critical, above all concerning the incompetence and the lack of itineraries for the trips. If one refers to these conclusions and assessments by the embassies, one can often say that many delegation members go on trips at the state's expense to augment their own knowledge in the cultural sphere and their familiarity with the culture and sights of other countries. This is so serious that we intend to finalize this general report [obobshcheniye], and I think that it must even become a subject for discussion at the USSR Supreme Soviet, with both our economic representatives and our ambassadors being recalled from those places abroad.

I would like to single out, in particular, the agreement on training personnel for economic activity. Several hundred specialists have already attended, or are attending, training courses in contemporary economic management and trade in the FRG, France, and Britain, and are becoming Soviet managers. Not everything is in order here, either. Ambassador Kvitsinskiy reports that sometimes the wrong people are selected and that they are interested in the wrong things, thus surprising their teachers.

On the general political plane, the significance of the visit to western Europe can, in spite of each visit's specific features, be reduced to several generalizations.

What are perhaps decisive breakthroughs have been made in the ideological barriers to a peaceful new Europe. The trust in the perception of one another at the state level has strengthened. The humanization of our relations with countries having a different social system creates a powerful support for the peace process on the continent, support from the public opinion of millions of Europeans.

The standard of cultural contacts and common human contacts in general assumes even greater significance in this context.

The question has long been posed about the construction, on an equal basis, of cultural centers. Now it has been solved. The very atmosphere of visits, their content, and the participation in them of many representatives of our intelligentsia and the agreements signed open up new possibilities for those engaged in the arts, literature, and the creative unions to fulfill more soundly and more boldly the role of the ambassadors of perestroyka, and together with their Western colleagues, to shape the spiritual and moral forms of the peace order in Europe, and to create, generally speaking, a different European environment.

I would describe as an investment for the future the accords on widening contacts between the young, on exchange of schoolchildren and teachers and of their staying with families. There have been similar exchanges before, but only a small number of people have taken part in them. We will now be talking in terms of thousands.

I consider the renewal of contacts in the military sphere between the USSR and the NATO countries, which has been sealed by accords, to be significant. Defense ministers, general staffs, military formations, military educational establishments, and so on, are participating. Mutual understanding and even mere acquaintance in this sphere is, as you realize, a special element in strengthening trust and in predictability of military activities.

Just 2 or 3 years ago, all of that was looked upon as something quite improbable and undesirable. Such practice helps to shape an atmosphere in which one can act confidently, cutting down on defense spending, not forgetting, of course, that this must be on the basis of a balance.

During the course of the visits, accord was reached on stepping up parliamentary links. Their political significance in our times is obvious, and it will increase. It is still more important here to get rid of formalism and the "touristy" nature of exchanges. Incidentally, there is much in foreign parliamentary experience which could be useful for our democratic institutions and for working out the regulations of the work of the Supreme Soviet itself.

In the Federal Republic of Germany and in France, we were on the eve of the conference of the leaders of the seven leading capitalist states, which this time was being held in Paris. To mark the occasion, I sent a note to President Mitterrand, setting out the Soviet leadership's view on key world economic problems. The message generally concerned the following: The objective process of the internationalization of the current world economy requires a new level of multilateral economic mutual relations. In observing the efforts of the seven in coordinating macroeconomic policy, we come to the conclusion that the opportunities are there for ensuring greater predictability in world economic processes. This is a very important pre-condition for general economic security.

I must say that this is a very disturbing trend in the development of our current civilization, of which we are a part. Our perestroyka is inseparable from a policy of full-blooded participation in international distribution of labor. We need this, but the rest of the world will also gain from this.

The laws of modern economic evolution, which is linked to the increase in mutual dependence in the world, destroy the insurmountability of the watershed between the different economic systems. Although each preserves its own specific characteristics, they need each other. The further they go, the more they are needed. Incidentally, similar control instruments are being used. In the future, we might be talking of interlocking the mechanisms of macroeconomic coordination. The Paris conference was informed of our readiness for dialogue on all these questions.

Of course, quite a few contradictions remain in the world economy. Nevertheless, we see points of contact and reciprocal complementarity. In approaches to such problems, for example, as the settlement of the debt of the Third World we favor contributing to development, and to finding solutions acceptable to both the creditors and the debtors, to the donors and to the receivers.

Ensuring a stable development of the world economy also presupposes the creation of reliable ecological stabilizers. It demands a high level of agreement in overcoming the global ecological threat.

We, for our part, saw in the final decisions of the Paris session of the big seven a number of new and positive elements, at any rate in comparison with the past. There is some sort of advance. In general, we stated the idea in all our conversations, that these groups of three, of seven, of eight, or whatever, cannot decide the fate of the world and cannot decide for the people. We favor the internationalization of discussion of these global problems, which affect all countries and all sectors of our civilization. It is the United Nations Organization which is a suitable instrument for this; it has been waiting for this moment for a long time.

Speaking as a whole of the West European direction of our activity, one can draw this conclusion: The world has started to change. This is increasingly noticeable. Some people like it more, some people like it less, others perhaps do not like it at all. We know this too, they exist in the United States, in the Western European countries, and in other countries. Some help the changes; others hinder them. There are some who are waiting, who have not yet made their choice. It is important that the Western European leaders, and evidently the majority of Europeans, should have an understanding not only of the possibility, but also of the necessity, of building a new Europe. The realization that there is no alternative is growing stronger, that Europe must move forward, with the existing realities as a departure point, and not backwards, to times fraught with war.

There are many complex tasks to be solved, and hard knots to untie on the path to a peaceful time. From time to time questions are suddenly asked which sound as if they come from the past. What can we say? We simply quite often feel cold drafts from the period of the cold war. They still come through. Sometimes actual winds from the cold war.

NATO evidently considers it useful to organize them from time to time, sometimes jointly and sometimes separately. Very recently, we felt this in several speeches and declarations. For this reason, we need to be attentive. I would put it like this: We must not miss the chances that are opening up to move forward with our policy of initiatives, the processes that are under way, not only in the European area of world policy, but as a whole, and at the same time, not to lose touch with realities, and to act taking these realities into account.

In general one can state that, to use a Leninist expression, the peaceful cohabitation of different European states is becoming a reality, which no one can disregard any longer. Comrade deputies, these most major foreign political acts, about which I am informing you today, have their most important dimension within the framework of our ties with our allies.

We flew straight from Strasbourg to Bucharest to the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee [PCC]. The Bucharest conference was not ordinary, both because it took place at an especially crucial stage in the life of the socialist community, and because of the nature of the exchange of views which took place there. The documents adopted in Bucharest constitute an integral program of actions on the path toward a secure and peaceful Europe. They testify to the fact that the socialist states are reacting adequately to the challenge of the time. They are the fruit of collective work and they contain the contribution of each state. The conference reacted constructively to the proposals of NATO's Brussels session and stated that they go some way toward meeting the Warsaw Pact initiatives on reducing conventional weapons and armed forces. The conference demonstrated an understandilng, a common understanding of the need for the transformation of our alliance from a military-political organization to a political-military one, bearing in mind the new realities in Europe and the world. This will promote movement toward the goal proclaimed by the socialist states: the preparation, through the common European process, for the disbandment of the Warsaw Pact and NATO. Until the conditions for this are ready, we will develop relations between the blocs on the basis of nonconfrontation.

The top forum of our alliance, in many ways, also was essentially new internally, and was noted for the frankness and originality of its analysis of events. Were there, at the same time, different appraisals and views which did not concur? Yes, there were. We do not see anything bad in this. The times of ostentatious unanimity have passed. Despite the differing individual approaches, despite the fact that both the domestic and foreign policies of the various Warsaw Pact countries have significant specific features, the PCC conference nevertheless showed impressively the common political will for mutual understanding and cooperation. This is the main thing that was born out. The countries of the alliance are united in their approach to the cardinal problems of the world process. This enabled them to reach agreement easily on a policy based on common principles at the present stage.

The results of the Bucharest conference were, on the whole, favorably received in West European ruling circles. This is unusual, but it is in line with the new spirit of interstate relations in Europe. Our allies supported the proposal to convene a second, all-European summit meeting, on the model of that in Helsinki in 1975. It will make it possible to take a look into the future of Europe, to clarify the long-term outlook of the European process as we enter the 21st century. The Bucharest conference has confirmed once again that new relations are becoming firmly established in the socialist community, based on principles of full equality of rights, autonomy, and independence. It is now plain for all to see that there are no universal socialist models, and no one has a monopoly on the truth. Each people itself determines the destiny of its country, and itself chooses its system and structure, and no one can, on any pretext, interfere from outside and impose its own ideas of the policies of another country.

For the first time, a significant place at the PCC conference, especially at the meeting of delegation leaders, was occupied by a discussion of the profound reforms in the countries of the community. Fundamental aspects of the contemporary understanding of socialism and ways of renewing it were noted. A major conversation was begun on how to impart to their economic cooperation, in the new conditions, greater dynamism and greater results. We agreed to resume in the near future the in-depth exchange of views on this subject that was begun in Bucharest, making it more prolonged and specific. This is also a sign of the times, reflecting the imperatives of integrational tendencies in the world.

Concern for the destiny of socialism, understanding of the crucial nature of the present moment, a common interest in the success of the renewal process, all this had a strong effect on the conference's work. It is quite obvious that its results, just like the situation in the whole of Europe, also presupposes the renewal of ties between the Supreme Soviet and the parliaments of the allied states. In general, the character of the Bucharest conference, in combination with the results of the summit meetings in Cuba and China, allows us to say that our relations with the socialist countries are acquiring a more integral appearance, a factor in the positive processes in the contemporary, interconnected world, while at the same time preserving, and even intensifying, the specifics of relations with each of the countries.

I would like to use this occasion to stress once again the world significance of the normalization of our relations with the People's Republic of China. The USSR Congress of People's Deputies gave a high appraisal of this event. Incidentally, I was insistently asked questions more than once both in Bonn and Paris, about our reaction to the well-known events in Beijing. I think that it would make sense to set out, from this rostrum, the essence of the answers which I gave.

A process of change which takes place in such a country as China is a phenomenon on a world scale. We naturally wish the Chinese people success in their movement along the road of transformations, a road they themselves have chosen. On this road there can be painful phenomena and conflicts. We have voiced our attitude toward the Beijing tragedy. We regret that it turned out in that way. We favor the most acute problems being solved between the authorities and the people through political dialogue. That is what we think; that is the method we have chosen for ourselves but every people solves its own problems by itself. That is our fundamental and, I think, irreversible position.

We have the firm intention of making consistent and full use of the results of the visit to the People's Republic of China, and to contribute in every way to mutually advantageous cooperation in various spheres, including the scientific-technical and most advanced spheres. Work is already under way here.

A government delegation led by Song Jian, a member of the State Council, recently came to the USSR in connection with the Chinese Science and Technology days. Tian Jiyun, a Communist Party of China Central Committee Politburo member and a vice premier of the State Council, is now in Moscow. He is heading the Chinese side at the Commission on Economic, Trade, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation.

The development of inter-party relations is planned. I am certain that the Soviet-Chinese dialogue's new level is in accordance with the interests of both our peoples, with the interests of the Asian-Pacific Region, and of the entire world community, in view of the significance of that dialogue and those relations.

Comrades, our foreign policy course has demonstrated a certain degree of effectiveness because, as I see it, it is scientifically adjusted and has picked up the challenges of the time which have gathered head and the requirements both of our society and of the countries and the world we live in. Our fundamental choice is based on the new thinking and is the right one. The task is to increase the foreign policy capital which we have accumulated and consistently to use its dividends to the full for the good of our own people and general security and progress. Strict fulfillment by ourselves of treaties and agreements which have been reached is of decisive significance here, as is rigorous adherence to the spirit and letter of the decisions of the Congress of People's Deputies and its message to the peoples of the world.

The Supreme Soviet and its corresponding committees and commissions and the highest body of power, the Congress of People's Deputies, are faced with implementing effective parliamentary and constitutional supervision to ensure that our words are not at variance with what is actually done and that the instructions and mode of action or inaction of our departments and other bodies do not devalue our principled political directions, which as sometimes happens are lost in the labyrinths of bureaucracy and administration.

We will complete work on bringing Soviet legislation fully into line with the obligations which we assumed in Vienna, with the declarations for which we voted at the United Nations, and with other international documents which bear our signature.

It is correct that the Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs together with the Foreign Ministry has decided to hold special hearings on the issue of the implementation of the Vienna final document. The organization of monitoring treaties at interparliamentary level is obviously not ruled out. That would provide extra guarantees of their observance by all sides. It would be worthwhile for us to think about this initiative, and to think about the machinery which could be put into operation for these purposes.

I have already had to say that the new thinking is in essence the ideology and theory of perestroyka as a whole and not only in foreign policy. The results of our international activity only go to stress its fruitfulness. That suggests to all of us that the new thinking is capable of yielding more noticeable results in internal affairs too in a short time.

The sooner we manage to overcome the patterns of times past, the more boldly we approach the solving of political, economic, and social issues from the angle of the new thinking, the more quickly society will move forward and perestroyka will start giving Soviet people a tangible return.

All of us, in the Supreme Soviet, in the government, in the party leadership, and each Soviet citizen, wherever he lives, wherever he works, must remember that everything which harms perestroyka within the country or which discredits it has a negative effect on the international position of the Soviet state as well and thus reduces the possibility of using our foreign policy potential for resolving internal tasks and for the success of perestoyka itself. The positive processes in the world have not yet become irreversible, but at the same time the prospects for emerging into a peaceful period in the history of mankind have never before been so hopeful as they are now, and this has never depended so much on you and me, comrades, on the responsibility of each and every one of us for the great cause of perestroyka.

Thank you. [applause]

Gorbachev Answers Questions

LD0108195789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Question-and-answer session by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Supreme Soviet deputies following his speech to the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 1 August—recorded]

[Text] [N.N. Medvedev] Have they realized in the West—my question may seem naive—that any attack on the USSR, given the number of nuclear electric power stations, will result in all Europe perishing? I am asking you this because my electors are asking a totally different question: Are there not too many weapons when we have so many atomic bombs, meaning atomic power stations, on our territory? Do they realize this in the West? Thank you.

[Gorbachev] You have asked a question to which I should perhaps have foreseen in response in my information. I think, comrades, this realization is obvious, and it is, in my view, a prerequisite which stimulates a realistic policy.

[Nishanov] Thank you. Are there other questions, comrades? Please, Comrade Borodin.

[Borodin] Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, what do you think, can the experience that has been accumulated in the area of cultural, scientific, political, and economic integration in Europe be used, in a greater degree, for the purpose of intergration within the framework of the socialist community? This question is of a particular interest to me in connection with certain events that I can neither understand nor approve, so to speak, such as the customs barriers that are building up between certain countries of the socialist community, and certain other phenomena. I would like to know your opinion on this subject.

[Gorbachev] This is one of the most interesting questions. I think that through this communication with the peoples of Europe and the world our experience, our views and our policy have an effect, in one way or another, on other countries, we can state this. However, in absolutely the same way, we experience this influence, too. I must say, the experience that we get in this respect...[Gorbachev changes thought] I would put it even more definitely, without restricting myself to a diplomatic answer, as it were. We are helped in today's deeds at a very important and crucial stage of the country's development and in developing more balanced approaches by drawing upon and using the experience of civilization. There is, given all the differences in social choice, in systems, traditions, individual features, and psychological patterns of others, there are alot of things that link us together us, and they are linking us ever more strongly as we advance further along the path of the progress of human civilization, and this should be boldly used. This relates, I must say, not only to the economic sphere but to social policy too, let alone scientific and technical progress. I think that there are many things that can be borrowed and successfully used at a stage of perestroyka when we are pondering and finding new mechamisms of our society's functioning and the mastering of new forms of life. You know, on the whole, we are making no new discovery here, all this was said by Ilyich [Lenin]. One can only become a communist after having enriched one's memory with everything mankind has produced. Communism emerged not on the sidelines but on the main road when such a force as the working class came into the arena. It soaks in the achievements of the preceding systems and today, interacting with them, it will borrow everything that is in its interests. I think we should be free from the old stereotypes while adhering to our own values, choices, our political goals, acting within the framework of socialism, improving and rejuvenating it.

I am still answering generally, but I think that this is a discussion that could be continued in the framework of the intended meeting which I mentioned in my report.

[Nishanov] Thank you, Mikhail Sergeyevich. (?Fedorov), please.

[(?Fedorov)] It seems to me that your address is a marvellous first step on the path to making the corps of deputies professional where questions of foreign policy are concerned. In this connection I would very much like to know your personal opinion: What do you think of the work of our international journalists? Does it not seem to you—it does to me, and that is probably why I am asking the question—that they are too one-sided, superficial, and sometimes even evaluate our foreign policy euphorically, while their Western colleagues analyze all our foreign policy moves and analyze every agreement. We do not do this. I think that we deputies need this badly in conditions of our realities.

[Gorbachev] In my opinion, the euphoria is more in the West than among our journalists in everything I read that is reprinted from there; so much is said. As for ours, I do not think they are so lavish. They even contrive not to see some things; but that, so to say, is my personal reaction. I am certainly not asking them to start competing with the Western press in this regard. No. I maintain that our journalistic corps, the international one, is perhaps one of the strongest if we compare it to journalists in other fields, and it is capable of doing its business very competently. It seems to me that the process of perestroyka is under way here too, and this process has led to a very interesting and important discussion that, I must say, not only helps our public to have a better concept of our foreign policy, and of the clashes of our initiatives, of the discussions that are taking place in the context of the clashes of various approaches on the world arena, but they also make it possible to evaluate better, I think, the substantiality and the breakthrough that has happened in our foreign policy at the current stage.

Nevertheless, I want to end by saying this: There is movement in this direction, and I think it will be fruitful.

[Nishanov] Your question please.

[Neyland] Deputy Neyland. I am from Riga. Mikhail Sergeyevich, you said there is a stereotype that we have perhaps gone too far in the disarmament process. It seems to me personally that we had gone so far in the process of the arms' race that we have to keep on going back. In this connection, you mentioned the positive experience of the West, you mentioned the discussions that have just taken place in the U.S. Congress on the subject of arms' expenditure. Well, naturally you know, many people know, that the Americans are constantly thinking about new military programs. Americans know what Midgetman is, what Minuteman is, what SDI is, what B-2 is, and so on and so forth. We recently read: Here is a new bomber, a Tupolev, very expensive; but we do not know what other TU's we have, what other military programs we have, and whether we need them. The Americans are always talking about it. They do not have anti-aircraft defense, we do. Do we need it? It is very prestigious to have something more or less the same as Stealth, but is it worth, for the sake of this prestige, for the sake of this toy—forgive me—to pay so much money and then later give it up. We have given up many systems that we have absolutely no need of, and as you know, we have more systems than the Americans do. As chairman of the Defense Council, what do you think? Perhaps the time will come, and has already come, to talk about our military programs too, starting with the real military danger that exists today.

That is my first question. The second is: You have introduced the concept of morality into the USSR's foreign policy. Our Congress' resolution and decision speaks for the first time of a moral element in the USSR's foreign policy. Therefore, I want to ask you a question that you will understand at once. This is a phrase from the Soviet-Iranian declaration: The Soviet side has agreed to cooperate with the Iranian side in strengthening its defense capability. We have not commented on this phrase anywhere, although you know very well that this phrase gave rise to, and still gives rise to, many questions, to put it mildly, and criticism based on the morality [words indistinct] based on the impression we have of Iran. Thank you.

[Gorbachev] I understood that the applause that almost broke out means that the questions are clear. [laughter] All right, yes? They were simply put in such a way as to contain the reply, too. Comrades, I have to say that we are certainly now preparing for the autumn session—we will have to confirm the Defense Council, the proposals. We will, obviously, have a pretext for deepening our conversation on these matters. However, I can say now that what you are raising has long concerned the Soviet leadership. It is precisely that concern, precisely, competing over more and more new programs, tooth and nail, that is one of the preconditions for the fact that we have had to think about new approaches, it is one of the imperatives which issued from here that we need a new policy, a new way of thinking. Having raised the question like that on a theoretical level, we have had to think about policy. Ultimately we received a response from our partners—I will call them that, I will not call them enemies, but partners in talks. We arrived at the need to draw up a new military doctrine, a defensive doctrine, and this has led us to make important changes in our approach to the whole Armed Forces structure. Also included here are the problems that you are speaking of.

So our Army is currently on the road to profound changes. It has to be the kind of Army we need, the kind dictated by the situation. It has to be able to ensure the country's security, but it has to be modern both technically and professionally. We have resolutely embarked upon the road of cutting many programs and have already cut many of them. This concerns dozens of programs. This process is under way, but I would like to say once more that it will proceed in such a way that the most important thing is ensured—security, reliable security for the country. As far as the rest is concerned, let us be specific: It apparently requires debate in greater depth in committee and probably more will be revealed in closed sessions within the framework of this problem when we talk about forming and setting up the new Defense Council. I assure you that there are things to report to you there, and I hope you will also have something to say and some questions to ask.

The question of morality and what is set out in the well-known final document about the meeting with the President Rafsanjani to the USSR [as heard]: I think that the policy addressed to the world community calling for the restructuring of relations on the principles of common sense and cooperation, on the basis of reducing nuclear weapons and so on, does not remove the question of security. It only transfers it to a different plane. However, when it is a question of security, there is always a certain level to ensure it is sufficient; so to say, sufficient armaments in order to defend oneself. We support and conduct trade in armaments, although we are reducing this, and quite considerably, but it does exist both with the socialist countries and with other countries, including with this neighboring country with which we wish to build normal relations. It made certain requests relating to military weapons and concerning its security. We took certain steps, and I do not think that this conflicts with our ideas about responsibility for the development of international relations, for strengthening them, for giving them a contemporary direction calculated to strengthen international relations, not just maintaining and strengthening peace.

[Nishanov] Comrade Shcherback, what is your question? After that shall we end, comrades?

[Shcherbak] Mikhail Sergeyevich, in your speech at the UN session, you put forward a very interesting idea on creating a kind of council of ecological security. How can this idea be given concrete embodiment in the European home, taking account of our needs in ecological connections and general European needs?

[Gorbachev] It seems to me that this idea can be mostly quickly implemented here in Europe. For instance, the creation under the USSR Academy of Sciences of a special scientific center caused great interest in Europe, and they expressed their positive attitude and even desire to cooperate, to join in. On the whole, Europeans have a great need for a mechanism to be formed in the near future. That was expressed at all meetings with all the leaders of these countries and not only with the leaders but also with the scientific public, and with broad circles of the public. I think that this most likely may arise here.

[Nishanov] Your question.

[Unidentified deputy] Esteemed chairman, you have spoken a little of the possibility of taking loans from foreign states. I think you have already spoken of on what conditions and of how much. This thought reminds me of another thought. Today, during the break, I spoke very severely with the minister of finances, we almost quarreled. That minister refuses to say how much paper [pustye] money, not backed by assets, is issued every day. Actually, that minister, having issued 100 million empty roubles, may destroy everything that the whole Supreme Soviet may do toward democratizing the country. Well, that rule remains for him. I am forming the opinion that one whole sphere of our life—namely the financial—is hidden from us. Somehow there is no control supervision at all over it.

[Nishanov] Please, Mikhail Sergeyevich.

[Gorbachev] I think the theme that you are touching upon was a central one both at the Congress and in the Supreme Soviet, and today it remains the most important. On this account, serious work is being carried out in the government and it is even intended that on Wednesday, that is tomorrow, on Wednesday, Comrade Maslyukov, in connection with this interest on the part of the deputies will report some thoughts on, so to speak, immediate measures to normalize the economic situation. He intends to enlighten the deputies so they will have this information on the eve of, so to speak, the holidays. However, you asked me a question and I am leaving aside your quarrel with the minister of finance. You may continue it and ask Comrade Maslyukov something tomorrow, if need be. I shall say this: We are acting in a very responsible way as far as taking credits is concerned, in a very responsible way. In order to...[Gorbachev changes thought] I want to talk about another matter so as not to confuse two aspects—of how we take credits, the scale and size, in accordance with our potentials; and how we use them. Those are two, so to speak, essential aspects. Well, this is what touches upon the volume of the credits. We proceed from principled political directives [ustanovki]. We have to enter into cooperation, we have to take and use credits as all countries do because after all is said and done, it is we who are paying, it is our business given that we are paying. However, we have to act in such a way here that all decisions relating to the USSR are made in Moscow and not somewhere else. The fact of the matter is that some countries, in taking out credits, have got into a situation where they are dictated to regarding how to run the economy, the direction that the country is developing. I think that such an approach is absolutely unacceptable to us. Well, that is our point of departure. This may be discussed if anyone holds a different opinion. I personally hold this opinion and I think that neither the leadership nor our people will ever conduct their external affairs in this way, including in the sphere of credits, so that we are led into such a situation where decisions are made somewhere in the IMF or in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

[Nishanov] Deputy Mukhametzyanov, please.

[Mukhametzyanov] The situation in our international relations is improving much faster than the situation inside the country. How can we, the people's deputies, foresee an improvement at a faster pace in the situation in the country in your opinion? Thank you.

[Gorbachev] By our way of thinking, I would say, and I invite everyone to see that we are not suspicious of one another, let us collectively seek, through our thinking, that which we have sensed during these past few days. We sensed during the election campaign, that people supported the policy of perestroyka, conducted this campaign vigorously and critically and made great demands. This has become manifest in the present situation with the miners' strike and with the questions put from their side on how we should implement the perestroyka plans in the economic sphere. It seems to me that we are all worried about this right now. I do not think the Supreme Soviet should panic but should maintain its composure—the composure is there—and we must unite all the intellectual forces and all our creative potential to work out the kind of economic approaches that would both help us to solve urgent tasks, especially in bringing order to finances and the markets, and creating the long-term groundwork so our economy can become more dynamic and efficient. That which you and I have mapped out includes... [Gorbachev changes thought] well, on some questions Comrade Maslyukov will be giving you information on urgent measures; all the remainder will be prepared so that straightaway—in mid-September when the deputies return—they can get down to examining this whole complex of questions in the committees and commissions.

However, we must bear in mind that in the country there is an immense economy, immense responsibility, and if anyone thinks that there are simple, easy decisions, then I assure you there are not. We must, I am telling you, collate everything and consolidate things to find these answers, and not try—as sometimes has happened, even at this stage of the work of the Supreme Soviet and at the Congress—to chase one another into a corner. I cannot see why some people, with hints both open and concealed, cast doubts on the work of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, suggesting that he is trying to unite what cannot be united and to join together what cannot be joined, right with left, to marry them off, and so on. This is all conjecture, and what's more, very thoughtless conjecture and arguments based on an absence of depth of analysis and responsibility.

I am certain that if we are going to consolidate all the creative forces of the Supreme Soviet on making decisions, on searching for answers, on working out the decisions that our people are waiting for, this policy is essential to us. If we start a quarrel in this responsible body, disgrace will come upon this Supreme Soviet, and the people will never forgive us. [applause]

[Khudonazarov] Deputy Khudonazarov. Mikhail Sergeyevich, you spoke of interparliamentary links, and of us expanding them. In this connection, I have a wish. Unfortunately, there are very few books in our library, and in general, on this subject. Not to mention the fact that there is information scattered round among different people in different commissions. It is very important for us to be able to draw from this knowledge in order to be prepared. Besides everything else, we see almost every day that we want to find out how things are done in foreign parliaments on this or that question. So I want the scientific research institutes, the Academy of Science, and all those who have this information, to gather it together in our library.

[Gorbachev] I consider that a very valuable proposal. It must be implemented.

Gorbachev on Nuclear Moratorium

LD0108215589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1648 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Speech by President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 1 August—recorded]

[Text] Comrades: I do not want to reject a deputy's speech like that, because all the topics he raised are serious. But, if I am going to talk about it, I would uphold the committee from the standpoint that that is a key issue, the moratorium on nuclear tests. It would first devalue the weapons that already exist and have been armed. Second, it would obstruct the emergence of new sophisticated types and new, different versions of nuclear explosions. In general that would be of tremendous significance.

We took a unilateral step and kept to it for 18 months, but I think that since then the situation in the world in general, both in the Soviet Union and the United states, has seriously changed. There is a deepening understanding of the need to take the path of disarmament resolutely, in spite of the fact that there are other emerging approaches and forces with other intentions, and proposals, pursuing other goals.

Nevertheless, if this is how we describe the present state of people's minds both internationally and domestically, then we can return to this subject once again. If one mentions SDI, it is an independent subject, as is the ABM treaty within the framework of the Geneva talks process. So all that is being dealt with. Nonproliferation of nuclear weapons is also within the framework of the consultations and exchange of opinions. These are all subjects that are, as they say, in the works.

Perhaps it would not be worthwhile to overload that appeal to the point that everyone would get the feeling that we had simply given it up as a bad job and gone on to the next thing. We should simply stress this key issue in appealing to Congress regarding this special question, which, if it were to receive support from both sides, if that moratorium were to begin, then that would be, it can be appraised as an attainment with far-reaching consequences.

Comrade Velikhov has at his disposal considerably more information than I have, and can add something to this.

Discusses Afghan War Veterans

LD0108233289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1751 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Speech by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev at the evening session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin on 1 August—recorded]

[Text] [Gorbachev] Before moving to the examination of the manner in which we shall make the decision, I think it is our moral right to say on behalf of our Supreme Soviet to the comrades who fought in Afghanistan and who spoke here that their formulation of things is right from the point of view of... [Gorbachev changes thought] And now I am not dealing with the issue of placing people on an equal footing and so forth. They fulfilled their duty, they did everything with which they were charged by the state, by the country—they did that honestly, beyond any suspicion. That cannot be subject to discussion either. I think that issue is clear. [applause]

Today we should talk about what Comrade (?Pavel Vladimirovich Shitikov) wrote here. It involves the fact that at our Supreme Soviet we should make an evaluation, we should report in the final count on everything as it occurred and sum up the results. That is another aspect of the issue. This concerns making a decision which affects the country and the people and I think clarity should be introduced.

[Unidentified deputy] [uproar] We should at least orally address all the mass media today. Please, make a statement like it is immoral to link the authors of the war in Afghanistan with those who fulfilled their military duty. The newspapers, the radio, the television should in no way confuse these things.

[Gorbachev] Regarding the first part, I have already spoken about it, and regarding the second part, when we discuss it, then we shall ratify an evaluation. I am not preparing to give out any advances on that count at the present time. We shall do that collectively.

Now let us get back to the law. It means that we all agree on passing the law. The questions that cannot be delayed long should be examined by the government and the committees when the drafting of the law has been completed. Answers to those questions should be found in the course of subsequent work and submitted by October 1. In my opinion, that is approximately what the time scale is. In October—that is at our next session. I think everybody here agrees on that, because some further elaboration is indeed needed there—so only one question remains, that the rules concerning, essentially, medicines that apply to those who fought in the Great Patriotic War should be extended to those who fought in the war in Afghanistan... [raised voices] and travel as well. Yes. I think that by virtue of the specific nature and acuteness of this question, let us all make a special effort to find the resources. We shall give our government the opportunity to include new sources of financing, including the republic's enterprises, etc. We shall finish dealing with this question in this manner. Nikolay Ivanovich, that is probably how we shall do it. One must always learn the opinion of the chairman of the government, comrades.

Committee Chairman on Youth

LD0108233389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1435 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Speech by Valeriy Ivanovich Tsybukh, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Committee on Youth Affairs, at the 1 August Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin—recorded]

[Excerpts] First of all, esteemed comrade deputies, as chairman of the [Supreme Soviet's] Committee on Youth Affairs, I want to say that yesterday our committee debated the bill and supports it totally. These questions are also close to us because pensions are received by 1.5 million disabled young people 29 or younger. [passage omitted] I realize there are many problems crying out, but this problem is crying out in silence. Here are just a few facts and figures about the position of the younger generation. While we have been discussing whether we can be threatened by unemployment, it has become a sad reality. In the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan alone, 6 million young men and women are not working or studying anywhere. Indeed, the new economic relations that are in themselves a blessing sometimes engender a kind of discrimination against youth in industry. Financial autonomy, or rather its current interpretation, somehow throws out the young, that is, unsuitable workers. There are increasing instances of enterprises refusing graduates from vocational technical colleges, technical colleges, and higher educational establishments.

This situation may be exacerbated by the implementation, for instance, of Article 4 of the bill being debated today. It poses, on the whole correctly, the question of keeping workers and foremen of pension age in industry. Moreover, medical workers, teachers and librarians should have been added. However, if the guarantees of employment of young workers are not strengthened legislatively, as was done, incidentally in the 1920's by a special decree of the Sovnarkom [Council of People's Commissions], then this also may lead to a shortage of jobs for young people.

It is commonly known that problem of housing has been exacerbated to the limit. Only 10 percent of young workers have a separate apartment. Moreover, young people's earnings, devalued by inflation, remain extremely low, not to mention the R50 student grant. All this today forces many, mostly young families, to live as if they were in debt to their elders—a millstone around their parent's neck. You know about this comrades, not just from hearsay.

These and other unsolved problems of the growing generation are not only an economic and social but even, I would say, a political problem. I do not wish to dramatize the situation, it is dramatic in itself. The latest events, the strikes and outbursts of interethnic conflict from which you can learn the country's geography, are confirmation of that. You know, comrades, that among the participants of these events there were many, many young people.

Another alarming symptom is the sharp growth in crime in the youth sector. All this convinces one that urgent measures are needed, or at least a definite prospect, specific schedules for solving youth problems and development of real machinery enabling youth to solve many of their problems by their own efforts—by their own efforts, I stress. What do I have in mind? Youth funds at enterprises created by their own work and spent on their needs. This experiment has had much to recommend itself in the Ukraine and other regions of our country. Also needed are credit for young families to help buld housing—again by their own efforts, their own hands—in towns and in the countryside, and material support for students. [passage omitted]

Medvedev Reports on Gdlyan Case

LD0208065389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1515 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Report by Deputy Roy Medvedev on the work of the Congress of People's Deputies' commission set up to investigate the activities in Uzbekistan of the USSR Procuracy investigative group headed by Gdlyan, with brief followup remark by M.S. Gorbachev; from the recorded relay of the 1 August session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin]

[Text] [Medvedev] Comrades: The commission was created by the Congress of Soviets to examine the work of the investigation group under the leadership of Gdlyan and Ivanov in Uzbekistan and other questions. At the insistent request of some of the delegates and many committees in Moscow and Leningrad, they have asked our commission—myself and my deputy, the lawyer Bichkauskas—to make a short report. I will read it, although it will be published in IZVESTIYA.

In connection with the completion of work of the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and numerous requests by various collectives and individual citizens, we believe it is necessary to report that the commission set up by the decision of the first USSR Congress of People's Deputies for checking material connected with the activity of the investigation group of the USSR Procuracy headed by [word indistinct] Gdlyan, carried out the following work in June and July 1989.

At the general session of the commission, which was held weekly, the USSR people's deputies who are members of the commission listened to detailed reports and information from Gdlyan and Ivanov, USSR procuracy investigators for cases of special importance; USSR Procurator General Sukharev; (Karakozov), former chief of the USSR Procuracy investigatory unit; Popov, leading supervisory procurator of the USSR Procuracy; Major General (Avemarov), former deputy chairman of the

USSR Supreme Court's Military Collegium; and representatives of many public groups from Moscow and Leningrad who spoke in defense of Gdlyan and Ivanov. We also discussed the plan for current and future work. The commission members studied numerous documents presented to them by the USSR Procuracy, the USSR Supreme Soviet Secretariat, the USSR KGB, and some other organizations, as well as many hundreds of letters and appeals from individual citizens and groups, from investigators of the Gdlyan and other investigatory groups, from people under investigation, from convicted people, from those who have served their term of punishment and their relatives, from those convicted or acquitted by the decision of courts, and from party and state staff of Uzbekistan and other republics.

The members of the commission have begun studying some cases that have caused the greatest interest among the people, the case of Churbanov and others, and that of (Khint). Study of the Smirnov case is virtually complete. The commission has met with representatives of working people of (Zelenograd), whose deputy is Comrade Gdlyan. The commission is still receiving dozens of various letters and documents. Unfortunately, we still have not received certain documents we requested from Gdlyan and Ivanov from the USSR procuracy, and from the Party Control Commission and some leading party bodies. It may be assumed that this was connected with the generally difficult situation in the country. The commission is continuing its work, the preliminary results of which will be reported by us to the second Congress of People's Deputies.

[Gorbachev] Now comrades, I think that we must, in the name of the Supreme Soviet, confirm once again what has been said at the congress. We all have an interest in the most scrupulous, serious investigation of this affair. This, and nothing else, must be what guides the commission. In my opinion, we share the view expressed at the congress. It is not our view; we are once again sharing it.

Ryzhkov, Gorbachev on Pension Law

LD0208010189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1755 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Speech by Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, with remarks by President Mikhail Gorbachev at the evening session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin 1 August—recorded]

[text] [Ryzhkov] You understand that it very difficult for me to speak on these questions. No matter what problems are raised by comrades here—and many have been raised over the last 2 days—it is very difficult for the head of government to speak out against, let us say, one proposal or another, because I understand that these problems do exist and they must be resolved. We carried out the instructions of the Congress and the Supreme Soviet session with great difficulty in formulating these priority measures regarding pension increases and correspondingly identifying sources of financing these increases.

I should say that sources of financing affect the vital activity of our enterprises. You see that we have to raise insurance rates by as much as 30 percent in order to find those R5 billion; R1 billion is being expended because we are raising the cost of the management apparatus. I think that all the problems raised here must be carefully examined in laying the groundwork for the law on pensions that we should, in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Soviet, submit in October.

Naturally, these are difficult problems. We shall have to work together extensively because they must not only be adopted, but we must determine immediately where the money will come from for the subsequent 5-year plan.

As far as this specific proposal is concerned regarding our participants in the Afghan war, the internationalist fighting men, I would make the following proposal, Mikhail Sergeyevich: That the law should be passed now, because those 1 million or 900,000 people must take a careful look at what kind of money that is. They need to count those benefits. This means that these benefits need to be made equal to the benefits for participants in the Great Fatherland War. One needs a clear idea of what kind of money this is.

I propose that we instruct the government to submit these ideas together with the plan for the 1990 budget so his issue can be decided on as of 1 January. But I would ask for something else. I see that we are discussing the first part very easily, and naturally we all want to help people. I would ask you to discuss the second part, when we discuss where the money should come from, with enthusiasm. We have to get it from somewhere if we intend to fund this program. I am aware of a general mood that is pressing for a decision so that as of 1 January, let us say, internationalist servicemen can be on equal footing. Then let us...[Ryzhkov changes thought] Be aware from the outset that we shall submit a proposal that some people will not like very much.

But we shall have to take that on. I think that social justice is expressed in the very fact that someone should have to share something with someone else. We shall submit such a proposal with the plan on 1 September this year.

[Gorbachev] This means there are proposals. Are there no differences of principle?

[Ryzhkov] No.

[Gorbachev] There are only differences regarding the time given to the government to find the money.

[Ryzhkov] We shall submit these proposals with the plan on 1 September.

[Gorbachev] By 1 September?

[Ryzhkov] Well, the plan should be submitted to the Supreme Soviet on 1 September.

[Gorbachev] [voices from the floor] That is not necessary. Listen, I do not think we have to go into the subject of sources of financing now. There is the government. Let it make submissions for examination. This means we have a slight difference, perhaps... [Gorbachev changes thought] If the veterans of the Afghan war agree to that in advance, then it can be done. In general we are making a decision in principle. There only remains the question of time.

[Unidentified deputy] A very good proposal. We shall probably uphold it.

[Gorbachev] All right. [applause] Do not (?overstep) the meetings, because there really is the government. Thus, we can put it to a vote, with those additions that have been worked out by the committee and were reported by the government, and the more precise definitions that we have formulated here. This means that we are voting according to chambers. The members of the Soviet of the Union are voting. Those who are in favor of passing the law, I ask to raise their identity card. You may put them down. Who is opposed to it? Who abstains? The law has been passed by the Soviet of the Union. The members of the Soviet of Nationalities are to vote. I ask those to vote who are in favor of adopting the law. I ask you to put your cards down. Who is opposed to it? Who abstains? The law is adopted. Thus, the Supreme Soviet passes the law unanimously. [applause]

Deputies Call for Nuclear Moratorium

LD0108144189 Moscow TASS in English 1411 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow August 1 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The USSR Supreme Soviet today endorsed an appeal to the U.S. Congress regarding a moratorium on nuclear explosions and a ban on nuclear tests.

The appeal says that a complete nuclear test ban has been on the agenda for more than 25 years. Our powers, the document stresses, could demonstrate before the world community the seriousness of our intentions to put an end to nuclear competition, to curtail quantitatively not only nuclear stockpiles, but also to rule out the advent of even more sophisticated types of weapons using nuclear technology.

The people's deputies of the USSR are convinced of the extreme importance of halting all nuclear tests, provided there is strict control, for the achievement of a turning point in international relations. In the interests of the earliest attainment of this task the USSR is ready to do everything necessary and possible.

We are for the immediate start of comprehensive test ban talks at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, the appeal says. At the Soviet-U.S. talks on limiting and ending nuclear tests the Soviet side does everything possible to conclude the first stage—ratification of the 1974 and 1976 treaties—and to move to elaborating commitments on a complete test ban, the appeal points out.

The deputies expressed Soviet readiness to announce a moratorium on all nuclear explosions on the basis of reciprocity, which could lead to the conclusion of an agreement on a verifiable comprehensive nuclear test ban, and proposed a discussion on the issue at a meeting of Soviet and U.S. parliamentarians which could be held in Moscow or Washington in the near future.

Text of Moratorium Appeal

LD0108185589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1720 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow, 1 Aug (TASS)—The text of an appeal adopted by the Supreme Soviet during today's session follows:

The USSR Supreme Soviet appeals to the U.S. Congress on an issue, the solution of which will determine to a considerable extent whether the nuclear weapons situation can be kept under control.

The task of reinforcing international regulations on nonproliferation, on effectively closing the channels of the nuclear arms race, and on the real elimination of the threat of nuclear war is now more acute than ever before. Through the efforts of our two countries, additional preconditions have been created for progress in this vitally important endeavor, yet we still have not overcome the inertia of the past which, unfortunately, is complicating the path to mutual consent.

For more than a quarter of a century, the question of the complete cessation of nuclear test blasts has been on the agenda. Our powers [derzhavy] could demonstrate to the world community the seriousness of our intentions to do away with nuclear rivalry and of not merely quantitatively curtailing nuclear arsenals, but of ruling out the appearance of even more refined types of weapons employing nuclear technology. These demands were voiced insistently at the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies. They express both the deputies' concern over the existing situation and their profound belief in the extraordinary importance of ending all nuclear tests—under the strictest monitoring, of course—for achieving a further breakthrough in international relations. In the interests of tackling this task as soon as possible, the USSR is willing to do everything necessary and possible.

We are for an immediate start to the substantive examination of the problem of the universal banning of nuclear tests at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. We welcome the proposal to extend the 1963 test ban in three spheres to include underground nuclear tests. At the bilateral Soviet-U.S. talks on limiting and halting nuclear tests, our side is doing everything it can toward the completion of the first stage—the ratification of the 1974 and 1976 treaties—and toward an urgent move on working out obligations for a complete halt to tests. Joint experiments by Soviet and U.S. scientists have shown the possibility of reliably monitoring compliance with such a treaty.

Deputies also are taking active steps in the sphere of domestic policy, in the area of reducing and limiting the Soviet nuclear test program.

The USSR Supreme Soviet is sympathetic toward, and supports the efforts of Soviet public organizations trying to achieve the rapid banning of experimental nuclear explosions. We regard with satisfaction the series of constructive steps taken in this matter by the U.S. Congress and public.

Addressing the U.S. Congress, we again declare the USSR's readiness, on any day and at any time, on the basis of reciprocity, to declare a moratorium on all nuclear tests which could be a prologue to concluding an agreement on a universal nuclear test ban subject to verification. We propose that this matter be discussed at a meeting of parliamentarians of the USSR and United States, which could be held in the very near future in either Moscow or Washington.

Local Soviet Sessions Recommended

LD0108105789 Moscow TASS in English 1003 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow August 1 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The resolution "on holding extraordinary sessions of soviets of people's deputies (local government bodies)" adopted this morning by the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet was prompted by concern over the situation in the country. It recommends to hold extraordinary sessions of supreme soviets of the union and autonomous republics, as well as local soviets of people's deputies, to hear reports of their executive bodies in order to thoroughly analyse the situation in each republic, region, city and district.

The USSR Supreme Soviet suggests that special attention be devoted to the fulfilment of socio-economic programs, the transformation of the structure and activities of the organisations and services subordinate to the soviets, and that measures be taken to resolutely overcome all that undermines people's belief in perestroyka.

The resolution points out that the full use of the opportunities emerging in the process of perestroyka for overcoming difficulties in economic development, for improving the communal services sector, for removing tension in social, economic and inter-ethnic relations should be promoted by more energetic implementation of measurss to expand real rights of local soviets, to make them pay more attention to the solution of everyday problems connected with working, living and recreation conditions of people and to uphold law and order, consolidating state and public discipline.

Up until now such questions were first discussed by sessions of superior bodies and then on a lower level. Nikolay Pivovarov, chairman of the Committee on the Development of Management and Self-Management of Soviets of People's Deputies, pointed out in his report that now a reverse order would be introduced: The problems that cannot be resolved by local government bodies (soviets) will be submitted to soviets of a higher level.

Summing up the results of the discussion, Gorbachev linked the success of perestroyka with enhancing the role of local governing bodies. He said that the resolution was a recommendation to soviets to heed the ideas coming from the grassroots.

Pension Increases Approved

LD0108163289 Moscow TASS in English 1546 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow August 1 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent: The Soviet parliament today adopted the law on urgent measures to improve the provision of pensions and social services to the low-income segments of the population. The law provides for a rise in pensions, allowances, and introduction of several privileges to improve the material status of approximately 30 million people.

Submitting the law to deputies, Soviet Finance Minister Valetin Pavlov emphasised that alongside raising the minimum size of pensions, the law establishes the same minimum pension for collective farmers, which is received by workers. The supplements and privileges, which earlier were enjoyed only by workers, will now be applied to peasants as well. The law also envisages a rise in disability pensions. Besides, the Second World War veterans are granted the right to a free acquisition of medecines and free municipal transport.

Most of the measures enter into force on October 1, 1989 rather than on January 1, 1990 as was initially planned. This became possible thanks to the initiative of the Soviet Communist Party, Soviet trade unions, the Komsomol and the Soviet Peace Fund, which set aside 1,300 million roubles from their funds on these ends. In the future, the money to finance the law will be gained basically by raising social insurance tariffs.

During the discussion of the law proposals were put forward to spread privileges to other categories of the population. An especially heated debate flared up on the issue of making privileges to be applicable to the participants in the war in Afghanistan. As a result, deputies adopted a positive decision and Soviet Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov promised to make respective financial corrections in the state plan and budget for 1990.

Akhromeyev on U.S. Visit

LD0208094189 Moscow TASS in English 0930 GMT 2 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow August 2 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev yesterday briefed the Supreme Soviet Committee on Defence and State Security on the results of his recent visit to the U.S.

Akhromeyev praised the competence and professionalism of members of the U.S. House of Representatives Armed Services Committee, where he gave a report on Soviet national security policy in the 1990s. This was followed, Akhromeyev said, by a frank dialogue regarding the course of economic and political reform in the USSR, the two countries' positions at the talks on strategic arms reductions, on the reductions in the armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe, tactical nuclear weapons and other issues.

The marshal visited San Francisco, Chicago and New York where he met members of the public. Akhromeyev said his visit to Stanford University, where the Soviet marshal was the guest of former U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, left one of the most lasting impressions. His interest was particularly drawn to the archives of the Hoover Institution, containing a large collection of unique documents linked with the history of the Soviet state from 1917 to 1926, including letters by Lenin, Gorkiy and Trotskiy's manuscripts.

The final days were spent meeting administration representatives. Akhromeyev also met President George Bush. The marshal described the U.S. President as an energetic and strong leader with profound knowledge of the problems of Soviet-U.S. relations and all aspects of the disarmament talks.

Replying to deputies' questions, Akhromeyev stressed that during meetings and conversations he kept raising the issue of the need to start talks on reducing naval forces, which is crucial for taking radical decisions on disarmament.

Speaking about his general impressions, the marshal said that the congress, the administration and the U.S. public at large had felt goodwill toward the USSR and to the policy of perestroyka.

Supreme Soviet 31 Jul Session Discusses Taxes

Deputy Attacks 'Racketeering'

LD0108112989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1505 GMT 31 Jul 89

[Speech by Deputy Tikhonov at the 31 July USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow —recorded]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] What are we to do? It is not up to the next congress to prepare a draft law on speculation. It seems to me that we should not be involved today with playing with paper. For you know the force of the law is determined not by what the legislators want, but by how it is received by the people against whom the action of the law is aimed. So this law will not act in the direction that we all need. So what must we do? Do what the workers, including the miners and future strikers, are coming out against [as heard]. Work out and adopt without delay a series of decisive measures, extraordinary measures, to combat speculation, especially with regard to food. There is no need to turn to the people. An extreme situation has already arisen in the country with regard to food, and extraordinary measures are needed. From this point of view we should give an opportunity to the minister, Comrade Bakatin—a very nice minister—to propose these radical and decisive measures. And they do have proposals on such measures in the portfolio.

The second essential thing is to start, or rather step up without delay, various efforts to combat racketeering. Comrades, food cooperatives are getting food supplies from state trading, from kolkhozes and sovkhozes and their supply departments, and from other sources, that are shrinking. For a racket is now pressuring these cooperatives that—by establishing monopolistic high prices—have reached the point now of becoming another form, a criminal one this time, of monopoly and monopolism. The Ministry of Internal Affairs and the KGB must be given the chance, and be allowed extraordinary measures, to combat organized crime today because of the huge expansion of this struggle.

Third, I consider that it is essential today to adopt a decision obliging the Ministry of Finance to start without delay to work out a system of professional tax inspectors, and to train people, inviting, among others, foreign specialists in this sphere, and to set up such an inspectorate.

Finally, I think it is essential for us to toughen up our control of the work of organizations of wholesale and retail trade, along with, I repeat, strict control of speculation on the market too, and of the work of kolkhozes and sovkhozes engaged in commercial activity. Here too very many grass-roots sources have sprung up to speculate in food. And now, the last thing, to toughen up the struggle against state racketeering, state extortion. I already have a sheaf of documents, copies of official documents, where rayon and town executive committees instruct a cooperative to pay 108,000 roubles to maintain the staff, to support the Sobriety Society with 30,000 roubles. Here, for one cooperative—I will not name the oblast, it is too shameful—for one cooperative, in the first quarter, from one cooperative in the town—I will not say which, for the moment—243,000 rubles are requisitioned by decisions of the executive committee of the rayon and town. Well, comrades, is that lawful? [murmurs] Do not make noises at me. I am in favor of things being done lawfully, of all enterprises without exception having their taxes deducted lawfully, only into the local budget. [passage omitted]

Deputy Calls for Unified Tax Law

LD3107210289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1745 GMT 31 Jul 89

[Statement by (Shchapov), deputy from Khakassiya and director of an open-cast mine, at the 31 July afternoon session of the Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin—recorded]

[Excerpt] Esteemed chairman, esteemed deputies! You have already examined a number of questions connected with the miners' strike, and the decisions adopted have been announced to the whole country. However, the situation continues to remain tense. The wave of strikes continues to move eastward. Why? Because originally it was promised here to make things better not in those areas where things were worse, but where there was more need for coal. The miners of Chernogorsk declared a strike, after which they issued their claims, their demands. They were supported by the KATEK [Kansk-Achinsk Territorial-Economic Complex] miners and miners from other regions of the country.

But the main thing is that working people in other industries are trying to use the same methods to draw attention to their problems. What are the main reasons for the state of tension and the social-psychological situation in southern Krasnoyarsk Kray and among the people of Khakassiya, whom I represent, and to which you, first and foremost, Supreme Soviet deputies, must draw attention in your work? First, the people are dissatisfied with the slow progress of perestroyka and the delays in reorganizing the central apparatus of management, ministries, and departments. The concepts of perestroyka have been brought to naught when they failed to pass through the bureaucratic command structure. The situation gets even worse when, on the one hand, ill-considered instructions are sometimes handed down from above, and frequently incorrect decisions are made because of ignorance of the situation in the regions.

On the other hand, because of the absence of true authority here, neither the work collectives nor the soviets are able to tackle the many social issues that face them. Second, the people are indignant not with how they live—I repeat, not with how they live—but at the injustice in the distribution of material benefits between the different groups of people working in the state enterprises and in the cooperatives. In the first instance, the results of labor are handled by higher organizations, and in the second by the workers themselves. The existence of harsh restrictions in wages and the virtual absence of economic interest in labor at state enterprises and the anything- goes attitude of the cooperatives has led not only to a distortion of the basis of socialist principles on payment according to one's labor, but has opened innumerable loopholes and the pumping of cash from state enterprises into the pockets of smart operators through the cooperatives.

Comrades, we must level out the rights of all collectives within the framework of one law. We must not adopt all kinds of laws—one law for state enterprises, one for cooperatives—all enterprises must be equal. [passage omitted]

31 Jul Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported

Deputies Discuss Taxes, Cooperatives

LD3107164789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1429 GMT on 31 July begins broadcasting a recorded relay of the morning sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin, chaired by Vice President A.I. Lukyanov.

At 1429 GMT, the session is declared open. Lukyanov says that 394 deputies had registered by 1000. It is intended to complete work on confirming decrees and discuss taxes on cooperatives; many deputies want to speak.

At 1430 GMT, Deputy Kirilov is invited to speak, but he does not respond, so Bronshteyn is called instead. He comments on Tikhonov's speech, then says he by chance met cooperative workers from Estonia, mainly working in Pskov Oblast, who confirmed fears that efficient cooperatives will be hit by the tax decree, while speculators would get off scot free. There is a need for a package of measures to protect cooperatives. Local bodies must realize that an attempt to swell their budgets will be counterproductive. Another problem is to step up measures against speculators, and a third is to set up financial experts.

At 1438 GMT, Gritsenko, chairman of the Commission on Labor, Prices, and Social Policy, talks about the discussions that have been held on both the decree and on the problem of developing the cooperative movement. The discussions concluded that the decree can be confirmed with some amendments and the introduction of supplementary measures, which he proceeds to outline.

At 1447 GMT, Buachidze addresses the deputies on behalf of Likhachev and the Soviet Culture Fund on the subject of cooperatives involved in restoring ancient cultural monuments of various kinds. He suggests amendments to one article so cooperatives set up by the Culture Fund can be released from taxes and the money can go to the fund.

At 1449 GMT, Stepanov reads a speech about the relations of cooperatives and the state and the regulations governing cooperatives. The law forbade interference by the state in cooperative's financial business. He says the law was a disgrace. He says the decree on taxes should not be adopted, and the law should be changed in ways which he describes. He says the state allows the cooperatives too much freedom, and state resources are going into private pockets. Consumer cooperatives have been set up to satisfy needs of people, and their taxes should be lowered.

At 1457 GMT, the floor is given to Zabrodin, who says that enough time has elapsed since the law was adopted for it to be evaluated. He says there have been thousands of complaints from electors. There is a lot of speculation, which is undermining the moral climate and social justice. Unjustifiedly high pay in some cooperatives gives some people wages that are much too high, whereas those earning by labor contract are badly paid. Republics have adopted a decree on the subject: he cites the example of the Ukraine. Local bodies were given the power to release cooperatives from taxes if necessary, since they are in a better position to know what is what. If the rate is raised, prices will go up.

Cooperative Tax Bill Studied

LD31071722

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the morning sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet session held in the Kremlin.

At 1505 GMT, Deputy Tikhonov, an economist, takes the floor to deal with three questions that have been expressed. He explains how the tax is worked out, which for cooperatives is based on gross income, and he states that the percentage should not be lower than that taken from profits of enterprises. Tikhonov then refers to the appearance of the official in charge of the tax department in the Finance Ministry before the relevant committees and commissions and points out the contradictions in the law. He is particularly criticial of the way in which tax is levied from turnover. He says cooperatives engaged in useful work are falling apart; there have to be measures against speculators, but there are no financial inspectors. He suggests various rates for different cooperative types. The law must not be simply on paper; extraordinary measures must be adopted immediately to combat speculation especially on food. Efforts must be stepped up against racketeers. Cooperatives are being crushed by rackets that are establishing monopolies. The Interior Ministry and the KGB must be able to deal with this. The Ministry of Finance must work out a system of financial inspectors, inviting foreign help, if necessary. The basis for food speculation have appeared in the farms too. There is also state racketeering, with illegal tax levies. At this point, deputies in the audience shout out, some demanding specific names. Tikhonov mentions the Interregional group of deputies, which is greeted with applause.

At 1522 GMT, Deputy Komarov is given the floor. He calls for cooperatives to be divided into two groups. The first will work exclusively on state prices—most productive and building cooperatives will come into this group. The second group will be those charging high prices, speculators, those using scarce state resources—they should be taxed on these excessive prices, which will mean there is no interest in charging them. He calls for amendments to combat speculators. He then talks about contract prices, which he says have led to inflation and group selfishness he cites the miners as an example.

At 1527 GMT, Travkin speaks. He says that some previous speakers are against free competition. He agrees with Komarov. Measures must be worked out to improve the economy as a whole. Other industries are not likely to be more patient than the miners who called for decisions, not promises. He says that amendments to the law on state enterprises must be adopted before they break for the holidays. There must be an end to the dictatorship of ministries and departments over production. They must change over to financial autonomy methods. He makes proposals about the introduction of self-management and says that the supreme soviet simply has to adopt the decrees, in order not to betray the electorate.

At 1535 GMT, Deputy Alekseyev of the Committee on Legislation speaks. State enterprirses must be raised to the level of cooperatives, not cooperatives lowered to that of state enterprises. The decree must be confirmed, but with amendments and supplements, otherwise the construct that is slowly being built will collapse. He outlines these amendments. The supreme soviets of the republics should be called upon to study carefully what the USSR Supreme Soviet is saying. He backs Tikhonov's call for a financial inspectorate and fight against speculation. The law on state enterprises should also be amended before the session ends, he says.

Details of Tax Law Discussed

LD31071824

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the morning sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet session held in the Kremlin.

At 1541 GMT, Deputy Kisin talks about pensions and labor conflicts, and says that today's question should not be hurried to the vote. Cooperatives must be moved forward. He gives examples of cooperatives where taxes should not be levied; the kind of cooperatives that should have benefits; and rules for the closing down of cooperatives—all these are amendments he is proposing.

He also criticizes aspects of the law on cooperatives, and the relations between state and cooperatives. Cooperatives and state enterprises should be on an equal footing.

At 1546 GMT, Vasilets talks about the damage to workers' income. He is applauded.

At 1549 GMT, Lukin quotes a letter he received from a regional union of cooperatives reacting to the tax law with regard to cooperatives. Privileges should be given to productive cooperatives, and those working to state prices, he says.

At 1553 GMT, Sobchak says the issue is whether this new form of economy is to be preserved. He says the union republics have already adopted decrees on the rates of tax. He says it is impossible for cooperatives to attain equality with state enterprises, if only because they have to pay much more for their raw materials. For this the necessary amendments have to be made. He supports the Interregional Group's call on this subject. The amendments have to be adopted before the end of the session. Since the decrees of the union republics have already been adopted, many cooperatives, including very necessary ones, will have to close down with the present tax rates. The majority of speculative cooperatives will either go onto the black market, or will scatter round the union republics. The republics that have gone for maximum tax rates will simply lose them completely, and the Baltic states, which have been much wiser, will get them. He says the maxium rate of tax must not be more than 30 percent. The first 2 years of activity agricultural, construction and construction material cooperatives should not be taxed. Local executive committees should not be in charge of the tax rates—otherwise this is a chance for bribery. There is a danger from false cooperatives set up under state enterprises; he warns of legalized speculation.

At 1603 GMT, Golyakov takes the floor and agrees something has to be done about speculation, as Deputy Tikhonov said. A decree needs to be adopted on taxation; pensioners need to be encouraged to continue contributing to the national economy; the numbers of pensioners working could be doubled if the network of cooperatives is developed. He mentions the construction rate of homes for single old people, saying it needs to be improved.

At 1608 GMT, Neumyvakin takes the floor. He starts by taking up the subject of the cooperative movement. The invalids' association regards cooperatives as way of rehabilitation for invalids. He proposes amendments to legislation on the matter, involving the lowering or dropping of taxation on incomes of cooperatives uniting invalids, eg the blind. He notes the problems of invalids not being solved properly locally, giving examples, and cites data on tax paid in the RSFSR by public organizations for the blind and deaf.

At 1616 GMT, Doga takes the floor, saying a few words about cooperatives' work in the sphere of culture—preservation of monuments, and concerts. Young people cannot afford to go to concerts because prices imposed by cooperatives on tickets are too high—there are no comprehensive regulations on this. He says an amendment is required to the decree on cooperatives on this.

At 1620 GMT, Lukyanov calls a break, marking the end of the morning session.

Tax Amendments Debated

LD3107I849

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet session held in the Kremlin. The relay picks up from the beginning of the afternoon session following an announced break.

At 1621 GMT, Lukyanov notes that during the break more deputies put their names down to speak; two in particular are eager to speak so they will get the floor.

At 1622 GMT, Magomedov takes the floor, fully approving proposals on amendments made earlier by Sobchak. He reads telegrams sent to him criticizing the work of cooperatives and high prices, etc, leading to speculation. Masses of people have left state enterprises to go to cooperatives to make more money, he says, noting that honest workers are angry over such things taking place; the supreme soviet should review the law on cooperatives.

At 1626 GMT, Justice Minister Yakovlev takes the floor. He takes up legal matters touched on at today's debates. The decree on taxation of cooperatives has to be introduced, he says, noting that there are no legal impediments to doing so. Amendments need to be clearly defined. He supports a number of amendments that have been voiced or proposed regarding privileges. On legislation to avoid speculation and corruption, he says it is absolutely essential. At the next session jurists will prepare such changes to the law on cooperatives.

Somebody in the audience suggests this latter work should be done now. Yakovlev says it should not be rushed, but it should be well worked out and thought through. He talks about rates of taxation, present and proposed.

At 1636 GMT, Deputy Korshunov takes the floor a second time at his own insistence. He makes an impassioned plea to put an end to speculation, to defend "civilized" cooperatives, and to do so now. He insists that measures be taken now. His remarks meet with strong applause.

At 1642 GMT, Lukyanov notes how many have spoken to date and how many are still down to speak. He explains that most say the decree should be passed though with amendments taken into account; the question of 30-percent taxation has caused most division. Lukyanov rounds up what has been said to date. He says that a committee on legislation should be assigned to work on this decree, taking into account clarifications and amendments. Work on tax inspection needs to be done, as well as on unearthing speculation on food, for example. Deputies who have not yet spoken could pass their proposals on to the committee. Lukyanov proposes a vote on this, but an unidentified deputy takes the floor, suggesting that discussion on the decree could be held this evening.

At 1649 GMT, Alekseyev takes the floor. He stresses the need to sort out legislation on tax rates. Lukyanov says a commission should look into this entire matter, especially the 30-percent tax rate on which there is no real agreement.

At 1652 GMT, an unidentified deputy suggests dropping the word "extraordinary" in measures to combat speculation.

At 1654 GMT, Sazonov takes the floor briefly on the subject of amendments.

At 1655 GMT, an unidentified deputy takes the microphone on the subject of taxation.

At 1656 GMT, Lukyanov proposes voting on passing this decree to a committee for extra work. None are seen voting against. The motion is supported.

At 1657 GMt, Lukyanov tells deputies to open a book they have in front of them and talks about contents on laws which they have to pass.

At 1658 GMT, Dasokhov takes the floor to talk about the law on trade missions abroad. He resumes on work done to date and makes his own proposals on raising the role of such missions and personnel involved with them. A deputy at a microphone in the audience raises a point on proposed wording in clauses.

At 1707 GMT, a deputy talks from the audience on something needing to be written in about cooperation on ecology; mission representatives should buy items which are ecologically sound, he says. He mentions the upkeep of missions abroad and the costs involved. He explains existing procedures for mission on purchases of equipment concerning ecology.

Deputies Discuss Various Issues

LD3107185889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the afternoon sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet session held in the Kremlin.

At 1711 GMT, Travkin takes the microphone, asking if a law on state enterprises or other laws will be adopted at the Supreme Soviet session. Lukyanov says the subjects he has raised will be considered.

At 1713 GMT, Podziruk takes the floor, in uniform. On the subject of missions abroad, he wants to know about servicemen abroad.

At 1714 GMT, a deputy explains the categories of servicemen who work at missions abroad.

At 1715 GMT, Lukyanov tells deputies that they should look at the whole text of the law on trade missions abroad.

At 1715 GMT, a deputy talks about union republics' trade missions abroad, stating that this matter needs to be taken into account. Lukyanov says this needs extra work.

At 1716 GMT, a deputy adds a few words about ecological issues, emphasizing that the USSR needs to buy ecologically clean equipment.

At 1717 GMT, Lukyanov proposes voting on various decrees going into committee.

At 1718 GMT, Tsyplayev, a Komsomol deputy from Leningrad, talks about the law on cooperatives and taxation. Lukyanov proposes that his suggestion on amendments be put to the vote. There are none against and no abstentions. The law on additions and amendments is adopted.

At 1721 GMT, Deputy Alekseyev takes the floor to talk about amendments on criminal laws. Lukyanov wants to put this to the vote.

At 1724 GMT, Medvedev interrupts to question on the wording of aforementioned amendments concerning crimes against the state, anti-Soviet in nature, for example calling for the overthrow of the government.

At 1725 GMT, Alekseyev comes back to explain the meaning of the words.

At 1726 GMT, Leningrad Deputy Tsyplayev again, talking about sentences for state crimes. He suggests the exclusion of wording in one section.

At 1729 GMT, Burlatskiy takes the floor. On article 7 he proposes a better clarification of clauses relating to crimes against the state.

At 1734 GMT, Alekseyev takes up again, says thank you for suggestions made on the subject of "technical means" used for printing and distributing material. He assures deputies of serious legal work done on working out this decree.

At 1737 GMT, Tsyplayev speaks again, taking up the issue of sentences for illegal photocopying.

At 1738 GMT, Alekseyev says it is not a matter of how many copies were made, but the fact that such copying was done.

At 1738 GMT, a deputy takes up on the subject of foreign organizations referred to in the decree. He proposes 3-5 years, and not 10 years as a punishment, saying that the latter is too harsh.

At 1740 GMT, Denisov speaks on the subject of wording on attempts to overthrow the government system "by force." Deputies indicate they want additional work done on wording.

Further Issues Debated

LD3107191289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the afternoon sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet session held in the Kremlin.

At 1741 GMT, a deputy talks about the use of "technical means" for copying written matter.

At 1742 GMT, Lukyanov suggests handing the matter over to a committee for further consideration during the break. Deputies approve.

At 1743 GMT, Lukyanov takes up what Deputy Travkin said earlier; he reads a proposal that on Tuesday and Wednesday the trade commission should meet to discuss amendments made to the law on enterprises.

At 1745 GMT, Deputy (Shchapov) from Khakassiya takes the floor on the subject of the pit strike; things are still worrying and the strike wave is moving to the east of the country, he says. Workers in other sectors are beginning to raise similar complaints over the slow pace of perestroyka. There is discontent over unfairness in the distribution of goods, restrictions on pay; a law is required to make everybody equal as regards work. Price reform needs to be effected. Retail prices should remain stable. Speculation by cooperatives needs to be curbed, he notes. People are annoyed over inactive management personnel. He raises other issues over which people are angry—ecological issues, young hooligans.

At 1753 GMT, Vulfson takes the floor to talk about historic decisions taken last week by the Latvian Supreme Soviet session. He thanks the USSR Supreme Soviet for listening to demands on financial autonomy and economic independence; he will not forget these events. He shares his impressions with this assembly of 3 days spent in latvia at the Supreme Soviet session. He is worried about still-existing old stereotype thinking and conformism.

At 1759 GMT, Lukyanov announces a break until 1600. At this point the relay ends.

Yeltsin Discusses Interregional Group

LD3107210989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service at 1800 GMT on 31 July carries a recorded relay of the evening sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet session held in the Kremlin.

At 1801 GMT, Lukyanov opens the evening session and invites Deputy Alekseyev to speak.

At 1802 GMT, Alekseyev speaks about the work of the Committee for Legislation and Legality. He points out some amendments to Article 7 of the Constitution.

At 1806 GMT, Lukyanov puts the draft law of 8 April 1989 to a vote. One against, 2 abstained from the Soviet of the Union, and 2 against and 10 abstained from the Soviet of Nationalities.

At 1812 GMT, Lukyanov proposes examining a draft law on rules regulating the publishing of ussr laws and their coming in force.

At 1813 GMT, Nishanov speaks about the importance of television and radio broadcasts from the session. Press coverage is reviewed. A press center at the Supreme Soviet is to be set up. Other measures for disseminating information on deputies' work described. USSR laws are to come into force 10 days after their publication.

At 1823 GMT, Primakov invites Alekseyev to speak.

At 1824 GMT, Alekseyev speaks about the importance of this law. The different ways of introducing a law—gradually or simultaneously—are described.

At 1829 GMT, Lubenchenko suggests some clarifications to the law, which would strengthen the role of the Supreme Soviet in law-making. He answers some written questions from deputies.

At 1839 GMT, Nishanov says Lubenchenko's proposals and amendments could be adopted.

At 1840 GMT, Alekseyev clarifies some finer points of the amendment on attaching numbers to laws.

At 1842 GMT, Lukyanov says that law numbering has never been in practice in the country. All laws, however, have reference numbers.

At 1844 GMT, Lubenchenko from the floor makes his point on the problem.

At 1846 GMT, a deputy from the floor makes a comment.

At 1847 GMT, Primakov puts the law to a vote. In the Soviet of Nationalities: none against, eight abstained. In the Soviet of the Union: one against, eight abstained. The law was passed.

At 1849 GMT, Primakov proposes Chilebayev for deputy chairman of the people's control.

At 1850 GMT, Kolbin speaks in favor of the candidate.

At 1853 GMT, Chilebayev speaks, promising to work hard.

At 1856 GMT, Primakov puts him to a vote. Both chambers vote 3 against, 11 abstained. Chilebayev is appointed.

At 1857 GMT, Primakov says the agenda is over; various other topics will be discussed now.

At 1857 GMT, Podziruk speaks about the need to abolish registration, as it breeds unemployment.

At 1959, Yeltsin sums up the constitutional session of the Interregional Group. The prestige of some party and local soviet organs is falling. Elections should be held as soon as possible but the union law on elections is faulty and should be amended, he says. An extraordinary session of the people's deputies is required for amending the law as early as this autumn. His speech is applauded.

At 1904 GMT, Fateyev says the Interregional Group is obsessed with alternative solutions, and it slanders obkom first secretaries; for the group, radicalism has become a goal in itself, he says.

Deputies Debate Interregional Group

LD3107213989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the proceedings at the evening sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet session held in the Kremlin.

At 1911 GMT, Rayg speaks. He reads an appeal of the recent conference of farmers and farming cooperatives. All land should be given to those who work on it, he notes. The appeal will be published in the press.

At 1917 GMT, a deputy speaks about the need to raise pensions urgently. We have such pressing problems while the Interregional Group is leading to a split, he says. No extraordinary congress is required for solving the problem of elections—this is a luxury! His speech is greeted with applause.

At 1923 GMT, Sazonov asserts that the argument that the Interregional Group could lead to a split is erronous. There have always been the left, the right, and the center in every assembly, which differ in their approaches to solving common problems. The Constitution should be amended urgently at a congress. The Russian intelligentsia has never striven to seize power, he states.

At 1927 GMT, Roy Medvedev says that the proposal of the Interregional Group came out of the blue. It is not known whether the congress has the right to impose its laws on elections upon union republics. Democratic development cannot be speeded up.

At 1933 GMT, Mezentsev reads an appeal of a session of the Kazakh Supreme Soviet concerning the difficult situation with rolling stock which affects local industries.

At 1937 GMT, Ogarok says he was at the meeting of the Interregional Group and would like to share his impressions. Many interesting issues were examined there but no constructive solutions were put forward. We should take a firm stand on the group.

At 1944 GMT, Obolenskiy notes the country is boiling. In Kirishi, where a factory of biological concentrate is located, the situation is very tense, and there is even a threat of strike there. He reads a deputy request concerning subsidies to those who live in poverty.

At 1952 GMT, Martirosyan states he is against any kinds of splits. we should work hand in hand, he says. The Interregional Group is very productive. The draft law on elections that has been prepared in the Ukraine is worse than the previous one. We should act without delay.

At 1957 GMT, Primakov reads the list of those asking to speak. Voting shows the majority want to end the session.

After a little further discussion on whether to close or extend the session, the evening session is declared closed, and the relay ends.

Coal Miner Talks, Strikes, Production Viewed

Ryzhkov Meets Donetsk Miners 1 Aug

LD0108193489 Moscow TASS in English 1855 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow August 1 TASS—A meeting was held in the Kremlin today between Soviet Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov and members of the strike committee of mines in the city of Dzerzhinsk, the Donetsk region of the Ukraine, and local government bodies.

In their speeches pit workers and other participants in the meeting raised acute production and social issues. They pointed out that research institutes, design bureaus and machine-building enterprises, which do not duly regard miners' interests, move against the production of machinery which proved to be highly efficient in operation. What they suggest, frequently does not suit miners regarding reliability and efficiency.

The situation is aggravated by serious shortcomings in the labour regime, its organisation and remuneration, and in miners' social and living conditions. The housing problem acquired a particular urgency.

One more meeting—with members of miners' strike committees in several coal basins of the country—was held on the same day. During the exchange of views at both meetings constructive proposals were put forward on several issues. Ryzhkov informed pit workers that intensive work was going on now to elaborate a government resolution on the industrial and social development of the coal industry, and proposed to representatives of all coal-mining associations of the country to take an active part in this work.

Union Chief Meets Donbass Miners

PM0108131989 Moscow TRUD in Russian
1 Aug 89 p 1

[All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions press center report: "Miners at the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions"]

[Text] All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] Chairman S.A. Shalayev held discussions yesterday [31 July] for over 2 hours with representatives of strike committees from the Donbass on problems concerning mining work and everyday conditions, ways of righting as quickly as possible the neglected state of miners' social and consumer conditions, and the urgent measures which have to be taken to enhance the militancy of miners' trade union organizations.

The strike committees' leaders, which include trade union leaders, made a number of proposals aimed at further streamlining their trade union's structure, enhancing the mine trade union committee chairman's role, protecting elected trade union leaders from administrative diktat, and proposals concerning the financial autonomy of the sector trade union and its organizations at local level and improved provision of miners with warrants for sanatorium and spa treatment, recreation, and other matters.

The AUCCTU chairman spoke in detail about the draft Law "On the Procedure for Resolving Collective Labor Disputes," which is now being discussed in USSR Supreme Soviet commissions, and the AUCCTU Presidium decision adopted the other day on trade union committees' actions to promptly examine working people's collective demands and answered dozens of pointed, keen questions from representatives of mining collectives.

"We are very satisfied with the meeting. Although we still have many questions, and pretty tough questions, the answer to many of which will still require us to consider together, the discussion was nevertheless undoubtedly useful," was the way A.D. Bokarev, chairman of the Donetsk Oblast Strike Committee, described the nature of the meeting.

The following took part in the meeting: A.V. Kapustin, USSR people's deputy and chairman of the Sakhalin Territorial Committee of the Coal Industry Workers' Union; I.A. Zhdakayev, USSR people's deputy and bulldozer driver at Sakhalin Oblast's Pervomayskiy timber procurement establishment; V.N. Makeyev, AUCCTU secretary, who had returned from the Donbass; and M.A. Srebnyy, chairman of the Coal Industry Workers' Union Central Committee.

Striking Miners' Demands Viewed

PM2707091589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
27 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by R. Lynev: "'Amalgamate Directors' Bath House....'"]

[Text] Why are the miners striking?

The demands put forward during the strike and consequently the reasons which led to the eruption are, as has already been noted, divided into two far from different parts. The first includes general questions. For instance, enabling the miners to become masters a their own mines. That means primarily the right to dispose themselves of part of the profit, to channel the profit into the development of the extremely neglected social sphere of the mines themselves and mining cities, settlements, and regions. And this can be achieved by taking some of the money earned by the miners away from those management structures which were created for some incomprehensible reason but which are engaged in a comprehensible activity: imitating management but often delaying the process of perestroyka.

Only a blind man could fail to see here one of the main questions of perestroyka—the question of ownership, of power, which, as a number of speeches at the Supreme Soviet session emphasized, are acquiring a political nature.

Questions in the other group are far more numerous and specific. And, frankly, more trivial. They are questions which must be resolved locally, at the level of the association, mine, or pit. By a decree from the director. By voting at a trade union meeting. By including the workers' particular wishes in the collective contracts with the administration. But during the strikes who remembered the collective contract?

On the other hand the deputies in the Supreme Soviet are now circulating, reading, and discussing documents like, for instance, "Demands of the Workers of the Kirov Group of Mines Addressed to the 'Shakhterskugol' Leadership and Territorial Trade Union Committee" which do not raise questions of economic accountability [khozraschet], of the expansion of housing construction, or even of the improvement of food supplies for miners' cities but contain points like:

"Introduce a nigh time group in the kindergartens."

"Increase the issue of soap to workers to 800 grams a month."

"Issue special clothing as it wears out."

"Provide workers with the necessary instruments at the enterprise's expense."

There are no more and no less than 26 demands of this nature. You ask: What is needed to issue workers with the instruments determined by the law? Sending a minister to the spot? What are they waiting for before issuing miners with as much soap and special clothing as they need? The creation of a parliamentary commission? Or a government decision saying let's review the long obsolete norms for issuing soap and underwear? Surely elementary common sense suggests that since adults have night time work their children must be left in the kindergarten for the night?

Are there really no other means of achieving this except strikes which threaten to undermine the economy and perestroyka?

It is time that we understood that inconveniences which we have traditionally treated as trivial have accumulated over many years and have acquired a new, explosive quality. And a political quality.

And how much bureaucratic disdain for people, how many empty promises and irresponsible playing at social justice preceded this. And, on the other hand, how much patience from people, followed by dissatisfaction and anger that today even a point like "amalgamating the directors' bath house with the workers' bath house" becomes a demand of the miners which brooks no delay or compromise.

You can treat these demands as you please but there is no doubt that where thought is given to people and to the cause there are no conflicts about the bath house, soap, special clothing, or instruments.

Of course, these questions, although they have been put on a par with economic accountability, with the position of the central economic departments in perestroyka, and with structural changes, are of a different scale. But what will structural changes give without elementary concern for people? And what further impulses are needed for this concern finally to become the norm?

Kemerovo Official Cites Miners' Demands

LD0108104889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 31 Jul 89

[Text] Following the hot July strike days, working Kuzbass is getting into its stride. Our correspondent, (Vladimir Yuriyev), reports:

[(Yuriyev)] Representatives of the strike committee—now called working committee—together with the deputy chairman of the oblast executive committee are allocating produce and industrial goods around the cities. One can count the number of days that this fact of our life has become usual—a new but not the only fact. The plenum of the party and trade union committees and sessions of the executive committees are awaited as never before. Decisions are being made there which have not been written upstairs but which have been introduced from below, really by life itself.

For instance, the men of Mezhdurechensk, who were the first to start and the first to halt the strike, decided at the plenum of the party city committee on the question of handing city committee's building over to a house of pioneers. They considered that all the city's Communists should discuss it at party meetings.

The first elections of the city soviets of people's deputies are planned for the fall, but already today new people are emerging in the place of former leaders. Trade union bodies and the soviets of workers' collectives of enterprises are being renewed.

The tension may be relieved only by actions, but by no means by words. Today, people simply do not accept them. Mistrust has been expressed of the trade union committee of the Chernigovskiy opencast mine. The first elections of the work collective soviet of the mine of the Bututovskaya production association of Severokuzbasugol have been carried out. Such reports arrive virtually every day. New people are coming, including those who showed themselves to be true organizers in these 10 hot July days which shook the Kuzbass.

The pace of work in the working committees and of the leaders of soviet authority remain approximately as they were during the strike. (Anatoliy Pavlovich Pronin), deputy chairman of the Kemerovo oblast executive committee, says: Sometimes we don't leave before midnight.

[Begin recording] [(Pronin)] Every evening at 1900 the presidium chairmen gather, the results of the work of the day are examined and decisions are made immediately on burning issues. Some leaders have understood that democracy is license [vsedozvolennost], and yesterday, well, what happened in our presidium is a fresh example, and we were obliged to remove some leaders who had allowed a delay in the unloading of meat which arrived in our oblast.

Second, we have planned a session of the oblast soviet to bring to the deputies the ways of resolving all the demands, the protocol of which has been signed, both city and, in general, oblast demands and, in general, to talk and lay bare that whole problem, why it happened, and most importantly, the ways to implement those measures so that there is no repetition.

[(Yuriyev)] (Anatoliy Pavlovich), essentially the demands of the miners may be condensed to one: Give us the opportunity to earn for ourselves the good things of life as far as possible and to distribute them ourselves also. That is, it is a question of the transition of the Kuzbas to regional financial autonomy.

[(Pronin)] I think that is one of the main and strongest points of the protocol. It is a very responsible matter. However, most importantly, our arrangements don't yet contain specific norms. Because of this one section of this working group flew today to Moscow to the party Central Committee Socio-economic Commission to compare the arrangements we have with those of the people of Sverdlovsk, Belorussia, and other regions. This is a working group. It comprises 40 people. There are scientists there. There is practical work there. There are top leaders of our enterprises there. So that a responsible program is worked out already on which all of us and our working people want to work independently, not to ask the government constantly [word indistinct] (?how much should be) earned. We want to be in charge of that product which we mine so that it might be possible to attract consumer goods for it and foodstuffs. We want, as they way, to strive for the normalization of all spheres of life. Additional working groups for the development of a program of health, and welfare of mothers and children have been created, as well as, an ecological group which will formulate the oblast's ecological program. In general, tense, laborious work is being carried out every day. It must go out from the work collective. After the session we plan to go to our cities and meet with the collectives there and inform them of how we are resolving the problems before us. [end recording]

Ukrainian Official Fails To Satisfy Miners

PM2607130189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
25 Jul 89 Second Edition p 6

[Correspondent N. Mironov report under the general heading: "Respond to Trust With Trust"]

[Text] Pavlograd, 24 Jul—The collectives of three mines of the "Pavlogradugol" Association have begun work after a 6-day strike. However, eight mines are still on strike, despite an appeal from the strike committee to end the strike. The Pavlograd miners have added to the overall package of Donbass miners' demands eight specific ones of their own for the basin. Their discussion with V. Gladush, member of the government commission and deputy chairman of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, did not satisfy the rally participants because they did not hear specific replies to them. The statement that the satisfaction of the demands of the sector's miners also concerns the miners of the western Donbass continues to arouse mistrust. The strikers demanded the resignation of Ye. Ponomarev, general director of the "Pavlogradugol" Association, holding him largely responsible for the slowing down of the democratic process and the economic reform.

Coal Production Outlined

LD2907102889 Moscow TASS in English
1018 GMT 29 Jul 89

[Text] Vorkuta (Komi Autonous Republic) July 29 TASS—Miners of this city situated within the polar circle reached planned targets by the main indicators. They dispatched over 5,000 tonnes of coal to customers above the plan in one day. Yet there is a lag of nearly 178,000 tonnes since the start of July. Only seven in 13 mines in the city reached daily planned quotas.

Coal industry enterprises in Vorkuta began work to realise demands put forth by miners. It is planned to hold conferences of work collectives, party and union meetings in the next few days to discuss these questions.

Inta (Komi Autonomous Republic) July 29 TASS—The Intaugol Amalgamation picked up good rates of production, overfulfilling by nearly 600 tonnes the daily quota of coal output. The daily plan of shipment was topped by 2,200 tonnes. Dressing factories overfulfilled the daily plan by over 1,000 tonnes of concentrate.

Donbass Strike Situation Detailed

18220175 Moscow TRUD in Russian
22 Jul 89 p 1

[Report by N. Mokrishchev: "The Dialogue Continues"]

[Text] Meetings on the squares of mining cities of the Donbass last almost 24 hours a day. They are not just discussing and clarifying the demands of the strikers. People want to know the whole truth about the state of affairs in the oblast and in the branch, and in one city or another, and this truth is frequently late in coming or is related with aspects that are imprecise. And it is not easy to keep track of the exhaustive information when the situation is constantly changing and the scale of events is expanding.

The center of the strike movement has shifted from Makeyevka to Donetsk. Authorized representatives of the strike committees of all mining cities of the oblast have come here. After they arrive in Donetsk, these same representatives from Voroshilovgrad, Dnepropetrovsk, and Rostov oblasts will form a regional strike committee of the Donbass [Donets Basin]. It is necessary in order to unify and resolve the immediate problems jointly and not to prolong the strike. For serious harm is being caused. In Donetsk Oblast alone since the beginning of the strike they have failed to deliver about 800,000 tonnes of coal. Enriching factories have been shut down and coke chemistry plants are cutting back production. And the mine faces themselves are threatened with blockage and in some places flooding.

After the airing of the telegram of M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov and also the collective viewing of the live transmission of the meeting of the USSR Supreme Soviet where they discussed the state of affairs in the Donbass and the Kuzbass [Kuznets Basin], participants in the strike began to assess the existing situation in a calmer and more balanced way. They are beginning to understand the serious consequences of halting coal extraction for the country's national economy and the fate of perestroyka.

The strike committees are attentively examining the decisions adopted by the commission of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, and the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] working in the Kuzbass (and these decisions apply to the Donbass and other coal mining regions of the country), and summing up the results. It turns out that the majority of the demands of the Makeyevka miners have been satisfied, and by a decision of the strike committee, all six mines of Sovetskiy Rayon of Makeyevka, whence the strike came to the Donbass, are operating again. The strike has been called off and all five mines of Khartsyzsk have begun to produce coal.

In the rest of the places stormy debates at meetings out in the open are continuing. The most crowded is the square in front of the building of the party obkom [oblast committee] and oblispolkom [oblast executive committee] in Donetsk.

L. Ryabev, the deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; V. Makeyev, the secretary of the AUCCTU; and V. Shcherbakov, the chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, who arrived here Thursday [20July] evening, are looking for a path to constructive dialogue. By 0300, along with the combined strike committee, they were able to consider 32 of the 50 demands of the miners and to reach agreements on 30 of them.

"The search for a solution is so difficult because we are fed up with promises and official indifference to our problems," said a member of the combined city strike committee, a master explosives expert at the Zaperevalnaya mine, V. Koval. "A role has also been played by the poor information about the specific content of each point of the demands of the Kuzbass miners. We did not know precisely what they were, and now that we do we can interpret the demands made by the Siberians. In addition to this the Donbass has its own specific problems and we have our urgent problems. Contradictory rumors about why certain people in the Kuzbass have gone back to work and others are continuing to strike have also been an impediment. In my opinion, the mass media have not been on their best behavior here either."

"Which point of the demands evoked the most heated arguments?"

"The one about vacations for miners employed in underground work. We are insisting that it be not 42 days as was decided for the Kuzbass, but 45 days. The commission would not agree. But our mines are twice and sometimes three times as deep. And, for instance, at the 1.5-kilometer mark the temperature of the surrounding rock reaches more than 40 degrees."

"And what is the most appreciable achievement?"

"There are quite a few of them. For example, they have coordinated a package of demands related to difficult and dangerous working conditions. Now the family of a miner who has died will be paid a one-time stipend of the amount of the earnings of the deceased...."

"Did you find the support of the trade union committees active enough in this situation?"

"No. The position of the trade union committees in protecting the rights and interests of the workers was more conciliatory than aggressive. Therefore the strike committee from our city expressed a lack of confidence in the trade union committees of all the mines. But we are grateful to the oblast trade union council and the central committee of our trade union."

The dialogue is continuing.

Karaganda Miners' Strike Reported

18220174 Moscow TRUD in Russian 22 Jul 89 p 1

[Article by O. Kvyatkovskiy, staff correspondent, and A. Leybman, correspondent: "A Difficult Conversation Is in Progress"]

[Text] Yesterday's discussions in the strike committees created at the Karaganda, Abay, Saran, and Shakhtinsk mines continued all night. For the second full day, the rally at the monument to V.I. Lenin went on in the "mining capital." There are practically no people in the coal faces of the basin's 26 mines. And, naturally, no coal is being sent up.

"Our reserves of coking coal are only 50,000 metric tons," says N. Dridzh, general director of the "Karagandaugol" association.

For the most part, such coal goes from the coal faces to the area of the city of Shakhtinsk. Delivery interruptions are already being felt by the miners' closest accessory manufacturers, the metallurgists of Temirtau. In the estimate of O. Soskovets, director of the Karaganda metallurgical combine, USSR people's deputy, the metallurgists have less than a 1-day reserve of this coal, and they, in turn, have 5,000 delivery addresses....

O. Soskovets flew to Moscow yesterday in order to inform the USSR Supreme Soviet in detail on the demands of the Karaganda miners. The miners of Kazakhstan have added to the positions already put forth in the Kuzbass, Donetsk, and Vorkuta demands for prohibition of nuclear arms testing near Semipalatinsk, and for the destruction of intermediate-range missiles near Saryozek, which, they are firmly convinced, exacerbate the region's already complex ecological situation.

"We understand the consequences of our strike for the republic and country," said A. Kostenko, chairman of the Shakhtinsk strike committee, excavations machinist of the "Kazakhstanskaya" mine. "But understand us as well. The telegram from the ministry, with which we were familiarized last night, informs us of positive changes in the life of only the Kemerovo miners, without a single word on the Karaganda miners...."

Workers' pickets ensure strict order in all cities and in the oblast center. Kazsovprof [Trade Union Council of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic] Chairman E. Zhakselekov is in Karaganda.

E. Zhakselekov told us: "The Karaganda miners' strike has common roots with the events in other mining regions in the union. These are the extremely neglected problems in the economic and social sphere which have accumulated over the years."

An acute re-appraisal of values is going on. It directly concerns the trade union as well. The results here are far from simple. While at the "Kirovskaya" mine, the labor collective expressed its lack of trust in the profkom [trade union committee], and decided to conduct a special election, at a number of other mines, mine and site terkom [territorial committee] and profkom workers are on the strike committees.

Correspondents Report on Strikes

18220170 Moscow TRUD in Russian
21 Jul 89 p 1

[Set of articles by TRUD and TASS correspondents under the overall headline: "Miners Demand Changes"]

[Text]

Order Is Maintained

By TRUD correspondent A. Isayev:

Zverevo, Rostov Oblast—on the morning of 19 July, the first shift of miners at the 60th Anniversary of the Lenin Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] mine of the production association "Gukovugol" refused to go underground and declared a work stoppage. Other miners also joined them. A strike committee has been formed in order to lead the strike which is still continuing. More than 5,000 miners at the mine are taking part in it, as well as 100 workers of the local section of the mining equipment administration.

Chairman of the strike committee shift supervisor A. Kudrya says: "As early as the spring, they promised us to take care of improving the life of miners and our families. However, these promises are not being fulfilled. This, putting it mildly, lack of reliability has caused discontent."

One of the main demands of the miners is to give the mine economic independence and remove it from the "Gukovugol" association. The miners propose to sell the above-the-plan coal (they will mine it at some point, after all!) by a decision of the Council of Labor Collective at the mine with access to the international market.

The miners say: "We want to work rather than strike. The strike has been forced on us. However, we want to work with the utmost productivity and live under normal conditions."

Party, soviet, and trade union leaders of the oblast and the city of Gukovo have come to the mine to hold a dialogue with the strikers.

Order is maintained at the mine and in the settlement. The workers guard the shafts and equipment, and pump out the water so as to prevent the flooding of the mine by subsurface waters. At night, the workers' detachments ensure public order in the settlement. Pickets are posted on approaches to the mine which carefully see to it that nobody smuggles in booze to the mine or comes there himself intoxicated....

Passions flare in the square in front of the building of the administrative and service combine. An argument is under way on ways to maintain the combat-ready condition of the mine without stopping the strike, so that a maximum amount of coal could be delivered to the mine mouth as soon as they start work, without any warm-up. They understand that strikes are not the best way to resolve the existing conflicts. During the past day alone, the mine failed to deliver 10,000 tonnes of coal.

Start Working

By TRUD correspondent I. Ostrovskiy:

Pavlograd—this was the decision of a strike committee of the workers of 11 mines of the "Pavlogradugol" production association after 20 hours of non-stop negotiations.

This is what the chairman of the committee, miner of the cleaning stope crew at the "Blagodatnaya" mine S. Veselov said:

"We have received a report on the decision of the plenipotentiary commission which is working in the Kuzbass. We are satisfied with it. Besides, we have found a common language with the managements and local authorities on an entire array of regional issues."

At first glance, everything is in order. The labor dispute has come to an end. However, this is what I want to say. The list of regional issues raised by the miners contained about 50 items. An overwhelming majority of them were resolved favorably within several minutes. What was the reason for waiting while the problems accumulated? Why was it necessary to anger the workers' collectives and force on them a strike which has resulted in damages going into millions? Someone must be held accountable for this.

One more point. During the negotiations, it came out how low the level of glasnost is in Pavlograd. It turned out that an overwhelming majority of workers knew nothing about a multitude of positive resolutions passed by the administration and soviet authorities over the last 2 years.

"We resolved to start working. However, for a month we will wait for specific results. If we become convinced that we have been cheated yet again, we will carry on the struggle to the victorious end," continues S. Veselov.

The miners' strike has revealed a multitude of lacunae in the work of management, local authorities, and trade unions. Serious conclusions should be drawn on this basis.

Constructive Dialogue Is Under Way

By special TRUD correspondents Yu. Kotlyarov and N. Nadezhdina:
Kemerovo—by yesterday evening, an absolute majority of collectives of mines, strip mines, and enterprises of other industries of the Kuzbass discontinued the strike. It is certain that others will also embark on regular work.

It is not easy to make up for the loss. During the days of the strike, a mechanical aggregate got "crushed" somewhere at the coal face; in places the water content of mine workings got worse. It is not easy to "get the drift going" and establish the pace of highly productive work. Serious efforts and time are needed. Still, in the days past the miners of Mezhdurechensk have already shipped above-the-plan tonnes of coal. The miners of Osinniki and Kemerovo toil with increasing intensity.

Yesterday, the commission consisting of N.N. Slyunkov, L.A. Voronin, S.A. Shalayev, with the participation of A.G. Melnikov, first secretary of the Kemerovo Obkom [oblast committee] of the party, USSR People's Deputy V.I. Romanov, chairman of the oblast trade union council, and leaders of several ministries, departments, and trade union organs, discussed the demands of toilers with representatives of the labor collectives in a businesslike and constructive manner in the cities of Belovo, Guryevsk, and Salair. Specific measures for their implementation have been developed locally. Members of the commission have met with the citizens of these cities, and have responded to their question in detail and frankly.

Persuasion Does Not Help

By TASS correspondent:
Karaganda—the strikes in the Kuzbass and Donbass echoed at the enterprises of the Karaganda coal basin. On the night shift of 20 July, individual brigades and sections of four mines in the "Karagandaugol" association, located in the cities of Abay and Shakhtinsk adjacent to the oblast center, refused to go down to the stopes, calling a work stoppage.

Representatives of the labor collectives which have discontinued coal production justified this decision by the fact that in the mass media not all of the points of demands by the miners of Kuzbass had been revealed. By the evening of 20 July, 14 mines of the basin had already stopped. Large meetings of striking miners are under way in the central squares of Abay and Shakhtinsk. Representatives of the soviet and party organs of the city and the oblast are not avoiding a direct dialogue with them. Unfortunately, explanations and persuasion have thus far been fruitless.

Social Problems Are Focal

By TASS correspondent:
On 19 July, the entire collective of the mine "Khalmer-Yu" of the "Vorkutaugol" association discontinued work, having made demands of a socio-economic nature. Responsible functionaries of the party obkom, Council of Ministers of the Komi ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], and oblast council of trade unions arrived in Vorkuta, and took part in a meeting held at this mine.

The miners of Vorkuta forwarded a letter to the leaders of the country and the industry. It refers to the need to urgently solve the acute economic and social problems facing the coal industry, as well as specific issues of the toilers of the Far North. Emergency meetings of party committees of a number of Vorkuta mines were held. It was resolved to appeal to the Supreme Soviet of the country through the local USSR people's deputies with a request to put on the agenda of the current session an item on the work of the USSR Ministry of Coal Industry on ensuring effective and balanced economic and social policy in the industry.

Railway, Metalworker Strikes Highlighted

Strike on Leningrad Rail Line Viewed

LD0108215689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Excerpts] A meeting of the council of the working collective of the Leningrad-Finland locomotive depot took place on 1 August. Over to our correspondent Matvey Frolov.

[Frolov] One day last week, (Razmolodin) a driver from this depot, stopped his locomotive on the main line to Vyborg and the frontier. It turns out that he declared a 2-hour strike. As a result, the suburban train timetable was disrupted, and a train to Helsinki was delayed.

Yes, (Viktor Yakovlevich Razmolodin), just like others of his workmates at the depot, has many justified complaints and demands to voice: The management apparatus is needlessly inflated; there are many bureaucratic orders; the work-and-leisure rhythm is disrupted; things are bad regarding housing, meals, and other social matters; and the workers have not become the real masters of their depot and section. [passage omitted]

It may be asked why most of these questions, which are the province of the ministry, the line administration, the section, and the local soviets, could not have been settled earlier. Why wait for an exceptional occurrence? This was said with disquiet and alarm by everyone who spoke at the council of the working collective. Now back to (Razmolodin's) action. What does it matter if one locomotive or a train, whether a goods or a passenger train, stops even for a few minutes? But then, after all, the railwaymen hold in their hands virtually the entire country. It is not fortuitous that, in many civilized countries, transport strikes are very strictly forbidden by law. The men of the Oktyabrskaya line have many problems. They must be solved without delay, but in a businesslike and calm atmosphere, so as both to satisfy their just demands and to ensure the smooth running of the transport system.

Metalworkers Strike Over Unpaid Wages

18280159 Moscow TRUD in Russian
26 Jul 89 p 2

[Article by TRUD correspondent O.Pozdnyakova: " 'There Is No Money for Payroll....'"]

[Text] At 0800, a strike began at the major iron and steel mill "Krasnyy Oktyabr": The collective of the bloomer shut the mill down and quit working. This blocked one-half of the plant delivering metal bars and plates to more than 2,500 enterprises of our country and to many countries of the world. A real threat of down time was looming for the machine building industry which depends to a considerable degree on steel from Volgograd.... The conflict arose over delays in the payment of salaries.

"The workers made a lawful demand: to pay salaries at the time envisaged by the collective contract. The delay had already amounted to 3 days. This has become the norm since the beginning of this year, and, perhaps, this was when the workers lost patience—it is not boundless, after all. The enterprise had in its account the million rubles which was necessary for paying the salaries. To be sure, not on 10 [July], which was the payday, but only on 12 [July], so that was when they came for it. However, at the bank they were told: 'There is no money....'," said A. Polyakov, chairman of the trade union committee of the plant .

The trade union committee chairman continued: "People demanded that I report on the measures taken and penalties for the failure to comply with the collective contract. We began to sort it out. The finance people have 'objective' causes for everything. The main point is that nobody guarantees to you that the outrage with the delays of payroll money will stop soon. So, does it turn out that the strikes are unavoidable? In this case, the trade union is in an ambiguous situation. If we do not want to find ourselves playing the role of whipping boy we should control the situation. Otherwise, we should support the workers, that is, lead the strike movement, or demand that the government take emergency measures for paying the wages without delay. There are no other ways: We cannot 'ignore' this problem anymore. Just go and listen to the 'bankers.' They still have not understood that workers need something else rather than explanations...."

When I arrived at the bank in the morning, Ye. Dorofeyeva, deputy chief of the oblast administration of the USSR State Bank, head of the Department of Currency Circulation, kindly explained to me the reasons for the absence of currency using Volgograd Oblast as an example. Incidentally, the reasons are the same as throughout the country. Thus, last year the income of the populace of the oblast increased by 12 percent, and production of consumer goods by only 4 percent. In addition, the share of production of Group B consumer goods in the overall volume of output in the oblast has been declining precipitously. Ye. Dorofeyeva stressed that in the opinion of bank economists, no changes for the better are expected in the immediate future.

The population of the oblast has accumulated R8 billion, out of which "pent-up demand" accounts for R1 billion, that is, if we provide goods on the store shelves the buyers will produce this billion immediately. What can the economy of the oblast offer? If it really strains itself, it may "squeeze out" R4-billion worth of merchandise stocks and services. However, there is no guarantee that the buyers will not reject them. Therefore, the other 4 billion in currency which constitute the annual income of the populace are simply not covered by the deliveries of goods.

As they explained to me, under these conditions the bank is working together with the leadership of the oblast on a program of financial cures. First of all, it is necessary to sell to the populace everything that can be sold. Meanwhile, there is nothing to sell: Provision of loans for individual construction in the city has been discontinued, and there are no construction materials. Trade establishments which overfulfill "their" plan of sales and draw bonuses are refusing to increase it. After all, they could have engaged in more vigorous commercial activities and increased the amount of procurement of farm products from the populace. Alas, economic levers are inoperative in trade....

Enterprises refuse to produce consumer goods, of which they could additionally produce R383 million worth a year. For example, the "Krasnyy Oktyabr" in question has capacities for the production of consumer goods. However, the production of such goods amounts to 22 kopeks per ruble of wages. So, where would the bank get "live cash?"

So, these are the conclusions of Ye. Dorofeyeva: The situation is getting worse every month. They were forced to put in circulation additional R55 million during the first 5 months of this year in order to cover payrolls. In the second 5-day period of July, they sought a permission of the center for additional emission.

I still did not understand whether this could not be done on 12 [July] as well without waiting for the strike.

Still, why was the account of the plant empty on 10 July, the payday? As they at the plant believe, this is the fault of the new banking system which has slowed down the turnaround for settlements with consumers. This overgrown and cumbersome system cannot confirm to the plant the payment of bills as of the first of the month for metal shipped long ago, which is worth R20 million. Instead of services at one bank, the plant now obtains loans at the Promstroybank [Industrial Construction Bank], but receives money for the checks written at the Zhilsotsbank [Bank for Housing and Municipal Services and Social Development].

The case of "Krasnyy Oktyabr" is no exception. On Friday 14 July, the doors of the oblast bank were mobbed by cashiers of more than 80 enterprises and organizations of the city who still failed to get the delayed payroll, vacation pay, and business trip allowances on that date, despite their accounts and requisition papers being in order....

The strike of metallurgists lasted 9.5 hours. As soon as the wages were paid, the workers turned on the bloomer on one condition: that subsequent payments be made exactly on time. However, the bank is still not taking in enough money.

Where is a way out? How can the financial situation in every oblast and republic be improved and cured? At present, when the issue of regional economic accountability and self-management is on the agenda, regional organs of power have a special role to play. They should act industriously and vigorously in order to promote (by economic and, for now, also administrative measures) a rapid increase in the production of consumer goods at the enterprises of the oblast or republic, speed up the process of conversion, develop production cooperatives, leasing, and so forth. At the same time, the government and the central economic ministries should take resolute steps in order to rectify the situation as soon as possible. (Some measures have already been taken. For example, as has been reported, opportunities for enhancing the market by R10 billion worth of imported goods have been additionally secured).

Meanwhile, it is important to stress that all of this is not the responsibility of workers. Yes, they do understand the difficulties in the economy of the country. However, it appears to be beyond any doubt that people who have done their honest work should not be left without their pay. When, justifying themselves, they ask the workers "Where should we get the money for regular payments?" This question is not properly addressed. Everyone has got to take care of his own business. In any event, the workers should receive what they have made. We cannot create new prerequisites for a social explosion.

Estonian Commission To Study Strike Demands

LD2807135589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1308 GMT 28 Jul 89

[Text] Tallinn, 28 Jul (TASS)—A strike affecting several enterprises in Estonia, started on 24 July on the initiative of the Council of Strike Committees of this Soviet Baltic republic, has ended.

On Thursday [27 July] afternoon a meeting took place at the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee between the leaders of the strike committees, the united council of labor collectives, and the Intermovement [interdvizheniye]. As a result of the talks, a decision was made to charge Arnold Ryuytel, member of the Bureau of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Estonia, with the formation of a commission for considering the demands presented at the meeting of 21 July and by the strike committees. The commission will start work on 28 July.

According to facts received today from the Republican Council of the strike committees, enterprises have resumed work for the entire period of activity of the commission which has been established. The decision of the council of strike committees—to continue or not to continue the strikes—depends on the decisions made by the commission. The strikes, it was reported from the council, will also continue if the Supreme Soviet session planned for the next 2 weeks begins a discussion of the law on elections to the local soviets before the commission has made a final decision.

In connection with yesterday's speech at the USSR Supreme Soviet by Yevgeniy Kogan, a deputy from Estonia, who warned of the unpredictable consequences of passing laws on the economic independence of Estonia and Lithuania, the council of strike committees of

Estonia sent a telegram to the USSR Supreme Soviet in which support is expressed for the basic tenets of the concept of republican financial autonomy in the republic.

Railway Disruptions Blamed on Armenians

LD0208095189 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0104 GMT 2 Aug 89

[AZERINFORM commentary]

[Text] USSR Minister of Railways Konarev appeared on the "Vremya" program on 31 July and talked about the difficult situation that has come about as a result of stoppage of rail traffic in the south of the country in the area between Armenia and Azerbaijan. The minister rightly noted that this has grave effects, especially on repair work in the rayons of Armenia damaged by the earthquake.

But, somehow, he did not find it necessary to mention specifically where and by whom mines were laid on the roads and who put pebbles on the tracks. Thus, in front of television audience the minister created a completely incorrect image of the incidents which had really taken place. As was reported in the republican press as well by TASS, in fact all these events took place in the territory of (?Mekhri) Rayon in Armenia. Not only did they blow up the tracks, stop trains, and even fire at conductors, but at the same time the Armenians even today refrain from giving and guarantee about the movement of trains and the security of passengers and railwaymen. It was because of this that there was stoppage in this area of main railway line.

Shame! The minister and the "Vremya" program skillfully avoided all this. This is directly in the interest of those who are against restructuring—forces which benefit from exacerbating tension in the region and provoking people to illegal actions.

People Attack Vehicles on Road to Nagorno-Karabakh

LD0108165789 Moscow TASS in English 1603 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Stepanakert August 1 TASS—The situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region and adjacent areas remains tense as roadblocks continue to be put up and attacks made on passing motor vehicles, despite measures taken by the special administration committee, the military command of the special district and law-enforcement authorities.

On Monday [31 July] some 300 people attacked a truck convoy carrying building materials as it went past the Azerbaijani town of Lachin en route from Armenia to Nagorno-Karabakh. As a result, thirteen drivers were injured and three had to be hospitalised.

Three soldiers escorting the convoy were also hurt as they repulsed attackers, seven of whom were injured.

In retaliation for the attack, attempts were made in Stepanakert to close the Shusha-Agdam road, but they were promptly stopped by arriving militia and interior ministry troops patrols.

Colonel-General Yuriy Shatalin, chief of the Interior Ministry's troops, came to Stepanakert and Lachin district today to study the situation and adopt essential measures.

Armenian, Azerbaijan Officials Meet 30 Jul

NC0108211089 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1630 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Reports on the situation in the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR]:

It is common knowledge that as a result of the failure of the effort to guarantee the security of the mechanical workers affiliated with the (?Chimse) locomotive (?workshop), and due to the frequent attacks on passenger and goods trains in the Mekhri rayon [as heard] in the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], the [word indistinct] mechanical workers decided not to go to work. Furthermore, movement on the motorways dropped to a minimum level. Kerbi town in Nakhichevan ASSR's Il'ich rayon was surrounded. Consequently, the town's links with the rayon center were cut. The situation worsened and assumed dangerous proportions.

A meeting was held between the representatives of the two republics on 30 July 1989, aimed at preventing the recurrence of disputes at interethnic level. Asanov, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers; Isayev, first secretary of the Nakhichevan Oblast Party Committee; Dzhalilov, chairman of the Nakhichevan ASSR Council of Ministers; and Mamedov, Azerbaijan SSR minister of internal affairs, participated in the meeting on behalf of the Azerbaijan SSR. Movsesyan, deputy chairman of the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers; Khodzhamiryan, deputy chairman of the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers; (Marketyan), chairman of the Armenian SSR People's Control Committee; and Arutunyan, Armenian SSR minister of internal affairs; took part in the meeting on behalf of the Armenian SSR.

Colonel General Shatalin, commander of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Forces; Lieutenant General Grigorov, chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Transportation Department; and [name indistinct], USSR deputy minister of roads [title as heard], also participated in the meeting.

The Azerbaijan SSR and Armenian SSR Councils of Ministers decided on joint measures aimed at normalizing the situation and securing the unobstructed movement of trains crossing the territory of the two republics. A special recommendation was made for the 46 km section of the Azerbaijan railway line which passes through the Armenian SSR's Mekhri rayon [as heard].

The units of the internal forces of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs were ordered to maintain the security of railway transportation between the two republics.

The measures that have been put into effect are producing positive results. The track situation has been normalized. Passenger and goods trains have begun to move. Units of the internal forces of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs have been deployed in Kerbi town and in Ararat and Il'ich rayons.

'Refugees' Arrested After Abortive Baku March

PM2707132189 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 9 Jul 89 p 2

[Unattributed report: "At the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Ministry of Internal Affairs"]

[Text] On 8 July a group of about 100 young people, mainly refugees, tried to organize an unauthorized procession along Baku streets.

They responded to a demand not to disturb public order by offering resistance, with the result that a number of militia staffers were injured.

The organizers of the disorders were arrested. They included Mansur Aliyev, scientific staffer of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies, Isfandiyar Dzhoshgun, a person without nationality or fixed occupation, and others.

Prosecutor's office organs have instituted criminal proceedings.

Situation Remains Tense in Abkhaziya as of 31 Jul

PM0108152189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Aug 89 Second Edition p 4

[GRUZINFORM-TASS report: "Restoring People's Tranquility"]

[Text] Sukhumi, 31 Jul—The "Sakartveli" collective farm in Ochamchirskiy Rayon's Kochara Village is losing R50,000 every day in its tea picking because by no means all pickers go out into the plantation these days.

The process of the normalization of interethnic relations is advancing with difficulty in Abkhaziya, and this is why the situation remains tense in its cities and villages. Much is being done by party and soviet officials and people's deputies to restore tranquility for people and enable them to return to work. V. Khishba, first secretary of the Abkhaz Oblast party committee [obkom], had a meeting with the labor collective at the Sukhumi locomotive depot, where a strike by workers on electric locomotive teams ended recently. The issue concerned the work by prosecutor's office and internal affairs organs on investigating and instituting criminal proceedings against instigators of disorder and bloodshed. It was said that a number of workers at the locomotive depot, having spent many years at work there, are unable to obtain residence permits in the city. It was also pointed out that there are quite a few vacant apartments in the city while railroad workers are experiencing acute housing shortage. Similar meetings with an open dialogue were also held by oblast party committee [obkom] bureau members in Ochamchirskiy Rayon, where the situation is especially complex.

These days people everywhere are heatedly discussing an interview with V. Razmadze, Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] prosecutor, which was published by the oblast newspapers. All those guilty of the tragic events in Sukhumi, regardless of national afiliation or the office they may hold, will be held criminally liable, the prosecutor declared.

According to a Georgian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs report, there was another explosion near an apartment block in Sukhumi and windows were broken as a result of it. A citizen reported to Ochamchirskiy Rayon Prosecutor's Office that he had discovered 900 grams of ammonal, a length of safety fuse, and a detonator cap in his home. There were 49 items of firearms, including 3 training assault rifles and other rifles, confiscated in Abkhazia in the last 24 hours.

The situation in western Georgia remains alarming, with weapons stolen from paramilitary security guards' rayon departments and stations still in the hands of the population and used to commit unlawful actions. It was already reported that 180 persons under investigation escaped from Zugdidi City investigative detention center. Some 112 persons were returned there by 31 July. Work is under way to detect and detain the remaining fugitives.

Seven persons escaped from Khonskaya colony settlement 28 July.

CPSU Politburo 31 Jul Meeting Summarized

LD0108204289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Aug 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] On 31 July, at the meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, the results of the conference of first secretaries of union republic communist party central committees, kray and oblast party committees were summed up. It was noted that the conference had great importance for making internal party life more active and strengthening the CPSU'S influence on the course of perestroyka. Evaluations of the social and political situation and the revolutionary changes taking place in the country, and the ideas and conclusions on the CPSU's role at the current stage, which M.S. Gorbachev's report contains, are fundamental and are aimed at consolidating the party's prestige as the political vanguard of Soviet society. Participants in the conference voiced a number of proposals on improving party work, holding the forthcoming report- back and election campaign, and developing democratic principles within the CPSU.

The Politburo of the CPSU Central Commitee approved measures aimed at implementing the proposals and observations voiced at the conference, which closely correspond with the action program elabroated in accordance with the results of the April 1989 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee.

The issue of the social and economic situation which has taken shape in labor collectives in several of the country's regions, primarily coal industry enterprises, was discussed at the meeting. It was noted that in the coal-producing regions, serious social and economic problems had accumulated over many years. Labor collectives, local party, soviet, and economic bodies link their solution with broad use of economic independence at enterprises and implementing the principle of collectives earning means for renumerating labor and developing the social sphere. At the same time, as recent events showed, many workers' demands could have been implemented locally by the labor collectives themselves, in conjunction with the administration and trade unions, without resorting to strikes. It was noted that the USSR Council of Ministers is taking measures aimed at fulfilling the joint decisions of government commissions and representatives of working collectives.

The Politburo examined the issue of holding report-back meetings and elections in party organizations in 1989. In accordance with the CPSU rules and the recommendations of the 19th all-union party conference, they will be held in party groups, primary and shop party organizations numbering fewer than 15 party members. It was also deemed expedient to discuss the reports of elective leading party bodies, including the bureaus of union republic communist party central committees, at plena of party committees and meetings of primary party organizations.

It was stressed that the forthcoming report-back meetings and elections are called upon to play an important role in the process of reforming the party's activity, in rejuvenating forms and methods of the work of its organizations and committees, and in implementing, on this basis, the tasks of economic and social development.

The task was set to hold report-backs and elections in an atmosphere of broad public glasnost and comradely discussion, with non-party members taking part in party meetings. It is important to thoroughly analyze, from a principled party position, work in implementing the tasks of restructuring, and the democratization of the party's internal life. During the meetings and plenums, the composition of elective bodies is to be renewed, and, if Communists consider it necessary, cadre matters should be resolved. The decision adopted on this matter will be published in the press.

The results of the conversation between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Nyers, chairman of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] and K. Grosz, general secretary of the MSZMP were considered at the meeting. It was stressed that the meeting demonstrated the comradely mutual understanding between the CPSU and the MSZMP, their adherence to the further deepening of Soviet-Hungarian cooperation in all spheres, and their readiness to develop new approaches in resolving problems of economic interaction. In the spirit of the accords which has been achieved, instructions improving interparty contacts between the CPSU and the MSZMP at the level of central and local bodies and expanding contacts between the public of both countries and other matters were issued.

The Poltiburo approved the results of the conversation between M.S. Gorbachev and J. Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP [Mongolian Peoples Revolutionary Party] Central Committee, chairman of the Great People's Hural of the MPR [Mongolian Peoples Republic], who was in the USSR on a working visit. The commonality of the approaches of the Soviet and Mongolian leaderships to problems of socialist renewal, and the identity of views on the course of international development in the Asian-Pacific region and throughout the world, were noted with satisfaction.

The results of the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Gandhi, prime minister of India, and also of the conversation between E. Shevardnadze and P.V. Narashimha Rao, the minister of external affairs of India, which took place within the framework of the friendly working visit by the Indian leader to the USSR, were considered at the meeting. Satisfaction was expressed that the exchange of views had confirmed the coincidence or closeness of the two countries positions on key problems of international life. The consistent interaction of the two countries on the basis of the Delhi Declaration is exerting a beneficial influence on improving the international climate, including in the Asian-Pacific region, plus the unblocking of regional conflicts. In this connection, the commonality of the two approaches toward an Afghan settlement was noted, and the continuing foreign interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan was condemned.

The Soviet Union and India are doing their utmost to facilitate progress in the matter of a final political resolution of the Cambodian problem. It was confirmed that the course towards consolidating the diverse friendly contacts with India remains one of the priority directions of Soviet foreign policy.

The Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee heard and approved a report by Ye.K. Ligachev on the results of the trip by a CPSU delegation to the Hungarian People's Republic to take part in the funeral ceremony for J. Kadar, and his conversations with Hungarian leaders. The farewell to the eminent party and state figure of Hungary was an expression of profound respect for him, and a demonstration of support for the ideas of socialism in the Hungarian People's Republic.

A report by A.V. Vlasov on the involvement of a Soviet delegation in measures devoted to the 10th anniversary of the Sandinist revolution in Nicaragua was considered. The results of the talks beween the delegation and the president of Nicaragua, D. Ortega, who was handed a personal message from M.S. Gorbachev, were approved.

The coincidence of views of both sides on the new, peaceful stage of the Sandinist national-democratic revolution, marked by a switch from confrontation to dialogue, further democratization and a course aimed at national reconciliation, and the quest for the resolution of the acute socio-economic problems of the country was noted.

The Politburo approved the results of the working visit by Yu.D. Maslyukov to the German Democratic Republic, in the course of which matters of bilateral economic cooperation and coordination of the state plans of the USSR and the GDR for the coming 5 years were considered.

The Politburo heard a report by Yu.D. Maslyukov about a visit to the Federal Republic of Germany. As a result of the talks held, specific measures to put the finishing touches to an effective mechanism of bilateral cooperation were outlined.

Conference Examines Progress in Armenia Rebuilding

LD0108214289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Aug 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A conference took place in the USSR Council of Ministers today [1 Aug]. The progress of restoration work in the regions of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic that suffered in the earthquake was examined comprehensively. It was noted at the conference that no cardinal changes in solving these important economic and political tasks have taken place. The councils of ministers of union republics, ministries and departments were requested to sort out without delay the state of affairs at every construction site which is to be completed this year, and to achieve the unconditional fulfillment of the set targets for commissioning the projects. The attention of leaders of all ranks was drawn to their personal responsibility.

The conference was chaired by Comrade Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Comrade Arutyunyan, member of the commission of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee; Comrade Doguzhiyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the state commission of the USSR Council of Ministers for extraordinary situations; the chairmen and deputy chairmen of union republic councils of ministers; and leaders of ministries and departments took part in the work of the conference.

Latvian Supreme Soviet Discusses Sovereignty

PM0108133989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Aug 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own information report: "Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic"]

[Text] The 12th session of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet was held in Riga over a period of 3 days—27 through 29 July. The agenda included a discussion of a number of draft laws which will be of exceptionally great importance for the destiny of all the republic's inhabitants.

The greatest interest among the population was generated by the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet declaration on the republic's state sovereignty. Its adoption was advocated on the eve of the session by participants in a Latvian People's Front rally held in Cathedral Square in Riga 26 July. The need for the speediest adoption of the declaration was the main subject of the placards and banners carried by the picketers who surrounded the Supreme Soviet building, where the session was held, throughout the entire session.

As a result of the discussion of the two versions of the declaration submitted to the deputies a draft was drawn up which was almost unanimously adopted by the session. This document announces that the Latvian SSR will be further developed "in the conditions of real sovereignty as understood in state law and international law." The Latvian people are being given the right to independently implement legislative, executive, and judicial power that "guarantees prosperity both for the Latvian people and for all other national and ethnic groups living in the republic." Under this document the earth, its resources, bodies of water, and other natural resources are the national assets of the republic. The declaration recognizes the priority of republic laws over all-union laws, USSR laws come into force only after being ratified by the Latvian SSR's supreme organ of state power. The Latvian SSR's state status within the USSR will henceforth be determined by treaty relations, which will be reflected in the USSR and Latvian SSR Constitutions.

The adopted law "On the Latvian SSR's Economic Independence" and the concept of the republic's economic independence formulate the main tasks of implementing radical economic reform. The main points in this area are to gear the economy to people's social needs, to remove the gap between the population's income and the goods available to it, and to increase the legal and economic independence of the republic's administrative and territorial units. The sovereign republic will resolve independently all questions of economic policy, the shaping of republic and local budgets, the preparation and ratification of plans and programs for its economic, social, and demographic development, price formation, taxation, labor remuneration, economic incentives, and all questions of its internal economic activity.

There was a stormy discussion at the session of the question of banning political strikes, but the draft law on this issue was not adopted.

The deputies adopted a law on meetings, rallies, street processions, and demonstrations. It simplifies the procedure for organizing the staging of mass events, and rules out the need to obtain any kind of permission or agreement, requiring only that executive committees be given prior notice.

The session substantially renovated the republic's constitution. But, in the opinion of a number of deputies, it is still a transitional constitution on the path toward a new basic law. There were calls for sensible compromise on proposals that did not immediately suit everybody. The disputes included the ratification of a residency qualification, which was set at 10 years for elections to the Latvian Supreme Soviet, and 5 years for elections to local soviets. The advocates of this restriction claimed that it would "disqualify" just 3 percent of the population in the first instance and just 1.5 percent in the second. Its opponents noted that many prestigious people who have long lived in Latvia—such as V.D. Bossert, director of the minibus plant and one of the first elected enterprise leaders in the USSR—would be left out.

Estonian Draft Law on Farming Published

LD0108180589 Moscow TASS in English 1536 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Tallinn August 1 TASS—The draft law "On Individual Peasant Farm", which should define the legal foundations for the existence of a homestead farming in Estonia was today published in newspapers for nationwide discussion.

The draft envisages that land, forests, water bodies and local minerals are provided to peasants for open-ended use by the local authorities. Hunting, fishing, and taking in forest products in the territory of an individual peasant farm is allowed only with the consent of the owner. The draft also extends the right to pass the homestead farm onto a family member in case of the proprietor's death or to a heir who continues to manage this farm.

The operation of an individual peasant farm is based on private ownership of the property and means of production and also on personal labour. However, during seasonal work and in cases of another need a peasant can conclude labor agreements with citizens and agreements on contract work with citizens or organisations.

Under the draft law a peasant can open a settlement account in the bank and conduct foreign economy activity using the currency earned to develop his farm.

Lithuanian Komsomol Congress Debates Reported

18001329 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 16 Jun 89 p 2

[Article by N. Zdanovich: "Reflections at the Theatre Door"]

[Text] The beginning of June saw the opening of the extraordinary 22d Congress of the LKSM [Leninist Communist Youth League] of Lithuania in the Academic Theatre of Opera and Ballet. The reasons for convening the congress were most serious: In conjunction with the new political situation, which LKSM First Secretary A. Matsaytis referred to as revolutionary, a crisis has clearly developed in the republic Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League], a way out of which had to be found.

Those assembled saw a way out in restoring the independence of the Communist Youth League of Lithuania, in the opportunity to resolve acute issues on their own while defending the interests of the republic, and to manage the funds of the organization themselves. The delegates were unanimous, ratifying their opinion by a vote.

Greeting the Komsomol members of Lithuania, VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee Second Secretary V. Zyukin stressed the positive example they were setting for the all-union organization. He called this congress the beginning of a renaissance of the country's Komsomol. It appeared that the main issue over which the congress was convened in the first place had been resolved.

During one of the breaks S. Kozheuorv, assistant editor in chief of the central newspaper KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, stated his point of view that the congress had merely ratified a situation which existed at the moment it was opened because the Komsomol members of the republic have long been resolving their republic issues without deferring to Moscow, without waiting for instructions from "on high."

Radvilishkis Rayon Komsomol Committee First Secretary Z. Chelkyavichyus thinks otherwise. He asks a question: "What has Moscow given us? In all of our decisions, we must anticipate her reaction. This is what dependence is all about."

Certainly, it is debatable whether this dependence was unilateral, or also imposed some obligations toward the Lithuanian LKSM on the part of the all-union organization.

However, this debate is futile: The decision has been made, and, as they say, endorsed by all parties. From now on, relations with the VLKSM will develop on a contractual basis. The program and statute will determine the nature of these relations as well as work inside the republic Leninist Communist Youth League.

Perhaps the congress lacked stringency and consistency from the very beginning. Speakers came to the open microphones with suggestions touching on issues ranging from compliance by the new organization with its name to national military formations, from the Arturas Sakalauskas case to declaring the Baltic Area a nuclear-free zone. However you look at it, all this is very important, but the chaotic character of the discussion made it impossible for any line determining the work of the youth forum to emerge—a line which could become the foundation for a constructive discussion on the prospects for future activities of the union.

We should duly acknowledge the presidium of the congress, which attempted to steer the course of work into a single channel. It would have succeeded had not a discussion with so-called "democrats" inside the Leninist Communist Youth League of Lithuania developed.

The speech by a guest of the congress, "Sajudis" press representative A. Medalinskas, may perhaps be considered the beginning of this discussion. This speech can hardly be referred to as objective or even well-wishing. Having called into doubt any and all services done by the Komsomol to the republic, he charged that the honor of Komsomol members has been besmirched by innocent blood. He portrayed even the Pioneer organization as an extremist one. Let these wholesale, and therefore incorrect, accusations be on his conscience.

Be that as it may, a serious question concerning the democratic faction in the Leninist Communist Youth League of Lithuania arose at the congress. Does not this wording seem strange to you? It seemed illogical to me. Why don't the democrats wish to set up their own organization in defense of their positions? The thought flashed that people have automatically merged the notions "democracy" and "democrats." Apparently, the former is to be understood as a system and nature of social relations, and the latter as an ideological position and a certain type of political thinking.

Others offered a simpler explanation: The democrats want to set up their association using the material facilities of the Komsomol, using its press, funds, and so forth.

Be that as it may, given the words of A. Matsaytis that the Komsomol supports the creation of other youth organizations as long as they do not propagate violence and hostility, and is prepared to cooperate with them for the benefit of Lithuania and its young people, why do the so-called "democrats" insist on implementing their ideas exactly in the Leninist Communist Youth League, going so far as to replace the word "communist" in its name with "democratic?"

The delegates voiced the justified opinion that the Leninist Communist Youth League of Lithuania should first discuss the principles of its activities before stating its disagreement with somebody or something.

However, I would admit that while listening to the speeches, debates, discussions, and during the breaks I got the impression that time is still needed to consider the strategy and tactics of the league's activities, to set more precise goals, so that in joining it the young people would take a conscious step, being fully aware of the path they are opting for. Certainly, the word "communist" in the name of the union addresses the question about goals; however, at present it is necessary to draw a line between the genuine meaning of this word and its interpretation during the time of social stagnation. Were the several days by which the continuation of the congress was postponed enough for such a consideration?

Today, proceedings are continuing after a break of almost 2 weeks.

A guest of the congress, G. Akopyan, Armenian LKSM first secretary and candidate of economic sciences, voiced his opinion on the course of the congress: "The congress is progressing well. It is natural that many difficulties have developed; after all, the Lithuanian Komsomol is the first on the way to independence. It could be that your experience will not be right for us, because in every republic transformations have to proceed in line with local conditions. However, the initiative, active position, and desire to invigorate the work are important."

G. Akopyan holds the leader of Lithuanian Komsomol members A. Matsaytis in high esteem. "He is a real fighter," maintains G. Akopyan. "He has defended his concepts for a long time in Moscow, and he has never retreated." Many of the delegates with whom I have had an opportunity to talk are also of the same opinion.

Thus, the Lithuanian Komsomol has become an independent organization. It has an acknowledged leader and a draft program of future activities. The proceedings of the extraordinary 22d LKSM Congress are continuing. Will it be able to respond to the questions concerning the young people of the republic? We will see. However, let us also state our hope that it will.

Belorussians Appeal Abroad for Chernobyl Aid

LD0208093589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 2 Aug 89

[Text] Belorussian public organizations appealed to their compatriots abroad to help the people of the republic to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl accident.

Our correspondent reports that Belorussia has already spent over R1 billion on its aid program to those who suffered. However, the consequences of the Chernobyl tragedy have turned out to be much more serious than the scientists supposed. Particularly now, dosimeters and ultrasonic diagnostic equipment are needed. Expressing hope in their appeal, the public of Belorussia pledges to strictly check [kontrolirovat] the use for that special purpose [tselovov izpolzovaniye] of such aid in the interests of the population which suffered.

Moldavian Appeal for Ethnic Unity Published

PM1307113989 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 23 Jun 89 p 1

["Address to the Republic's Population by the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee and the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers"—SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA headline]

[Text] Dear Comrades!

We are currently living under the tremendous impact of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies which stirred literally the whole country and marked the beginning of the implementation of the main idea of political reform—the full transfer of power to the soviets.

History has yet to fully evaluate its momentous role in our society's development. But even today we have perfect reason for saying that it taught us all an open lesson of democracy and revealed the revolutionary essence not only of our transformations but also of our thinking.

The supreme forum of people's deputies convincingly demonstrated the dynamism and deepening of perestroyka and proved that the democratic processes of renewal are penetrating deeper the economic, political, and spiritual spheres increasingly deeply and that the process of assimilating new forms of social life is under way, albeit with difficulty.

Our own republic can offer tangible confirmation of this. Its present is distinguished by glasnost, democratization, enhancement of social awareness, people's lofty civic stance, and the implementation of changes in virtually all spheres of our daily life. Open and trenchant presentation of the problems perturbing working people and a critically demanding approach to the evaluation of party, state, and economic organs' activity have become the norm of life. Labor collectives are playing an increasingly large role in the implementation of economic and political tasks. Problems of spiritual culture, including those of national language, are being solved.

Perestroyka generated great hopes, but so far it has not produced the desired results, especially in the economic and social spheres. For a number of objective reasons, a substantial gap opened up in the republic between the planned tasks and their actual implementation. The food and housing problems remain acute, many consumer goods are still in short supply, the ecological situation is becoming more complex. A specific and principled discussion on this topic unfolded at the 13th Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum, which appraised the prevailing situation and mapped out ways to remedy it.

Naturally, negative phenomena in our economy engendered by anomalies and mistakes in the past, and omissions and shortcomings in the work of state and economic organs even today cause a certain amount of dissatisfaction among the population. Taking advantage of this, certain groups of people with extremist leanings are inflaming public opinion, fanning unhealthy emotions, and sowing confusion in the population's minds.

They especially stepped up their actions just before the upcoming memorable date—28 June, the day when Bessarabia was reunited with the USSR. Denigrating the importance of this event for the Moldavian people's destiny, rejecting all that has been achieved in the region's socioeconomic development, and exploiting the shortcomings which are the burdensome legacy of the times of arbitrariness and illegality, these people are striving to give the forthcoming event political overtones which grossly distort the historical truth.

In pursuit of this goal, attempts are being made to make the Moldavian people forget that back in 1918 a large part of their territory was captured by monarchical Romania which, during the 22 years of its rule, plundered productive forces and dealt a heavy blow to the region's culture, subjecting the people to the most cruel exploitation and humiliation. At the same time, 1940—the year when freedom finally dawned, Soviet power in Bessarabia was restored, and the dream of Moldavians living on the right and left banks of the Dnestr about reunification within the single socialist state of the USSR came true—is presented by these people as the year when the Moldavian people were supposedly deprived of their autonomy and independence and their territory was occupied.

Such opinions, persistently promoted among the broad masses of the people, destabilize further still the situation in the republic, undermine people's unity, prevent them from living and working in tranquility, divert attention and efforts from the solution of urgent economic and social tasks, and essentially retard perestroyka.

In view of the prevailing situation, the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers appeal to all citizens of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] not to succumb to provocative distortions of the essence of historical events associated with the Moldavian people's reunification, not to let themselves become involved in adventurist actions urged by irresponsible persons in connection with this date's 49th anniversary, and to display restraint and loyalty to their internationalist traditions and Soviet patriotism.

We address the working class, the collective farm peasantry, and all working people: The republic has virtually everything necessary for the normal operation of enterprises, farms, and organizations and for the creation of the prerequisites for the implementation of the planned economic and social acceleration programs. All that is needed is labor, conscientious labor augmented by the new forms of its organization, technological progress, discipline, and organization; what is needed is people's unity and cohesion. Then the problems which now perturb everyone will be solved more quickly and more efficiently.

We appeal to writers, journalists, scientific and cultural figures, and all the urban and rural intelligentsia to channel their ability, experience, knowledge, and talent toward the consolidation of all social forces and social movements, to set an example of nobility, mutual respect, and tolerance for dissidence, to do everything to strengthen our common multinational home.

A major role in the normalization of the situation in the republic could be played by party and labor veterans, veterans of the Great Patriotic War, and internationalist soldiers. We anticipate their comprehensive assistance to party organizations in improving the international and patriotic education of the population, primarily of young people, and in rallying the region's working people in a united movement in defense of the true ideals and goals of perestroyka.

We anticipate that members of unsponsored formations' aktivs will be sensible, and we call on them to approach with understanding and responsibility the complexity of the perestroyka processes which are now under way in the republic and which demand time and the application of all of society's energy, not to give free rein to emotional outbursts, not to involve young people and children in rash actions, not to resort to unlawful ultimatum statements.

The 13th Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum unanimously advocated the consolidation of all social forces on the principles outlined in the 19th all-union party conference decisions and in CPSU Central Committee resolutions and resolutely condemned and spoke out against all varieties of extremism and the fanning of emotions on a national basis.

It is well known that the idea of consolidation ran through the report and the majority of speeches at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. We all must safeguard and respect each other's rights and interests, we must display mutual understanding, goodwill, restraint, and patience, we must rule out violence in the solution of nationalities problems for ever, and we must ensure the democratic development of our entire multinational society.

In calling for consolidation and cohesion, the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium and government deem it necessary to emphasize that the entire population may rest assured that they will be protected by the law and that order and tranquility will be guaranteed everywhere both on the holiday and on ordinary days. June 28 is remembered by all generations of the republic's peoples as the day when Bessarabia was reunited with the motherland, the USSR, as a day of brotherhood and friendship. It has always been a holiday, it will be a holiday now.

The Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium and government give an assurance that they will do everything to deepen and expand socialist democracy, to further develop Moldavian national culture and the cultures of other peoples living in the republic, to ensure our economy's autonomy and its transition to self-management and self-financing, and to raise the standards of all people's social prosperity.

Kishinev City, 22 June 1989

The Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee
The Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
The Moldavian SSR Council of Ministers

U.S. Resolution on Nagorno-Karabakh Condemned

NC0108210289 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0340 GMT 1 Aug 89

[From the Republican Press review]

[Text] As has already been reported in the republic's press, the U.S. Senate adopted a resolution on the situation in the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. The resolution contained many calumnies which can only be described as interference in the USSR's internal affairs.

The Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium resolutely objected to the resolution and called for the cessation of similar activities by the official U.S. state organs.

The newspapers reported that the objection has been accepted.

Uzbek KGB Official on Fergana Investigation

PM1207160189 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 22 Jun 89 p 2

[Unattributed report under the general heading: "Measures To Stabilize the Situation": "At the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic KGB Press Group"]

[Text] Over the last few days the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] KGB has received a large number of questions from the republic's inhabitants asking for information about how state security organs and their staffers are taking part in localizing the consequences of the mass disturbances in Fergana, Kokand, Margilan, Tashlak, and other population centers in Fergana Oblast and what role KGB organs are playing in exposing the criminal elements which provoked these tragic events. Lieutenant Colonel A.N. Blagorodov, leader of the republic KGB press group, reports as follows:

The development of events in Fergana Oblast was covered in a quite detailed fashion in the central, republic, and oblast press and the events were discussed and covered in special radio and television programs. Of course, some points, features, and fresh details that presumably have yet to emerge may be added. However, by and large the situation was depicted quite clearly.

At present, as has already been announced, USSR Prosecutor's Office organs have instituted a number of criminal cases against the organizers and specific perpetrators of the robberies, arson, and killings and the instigators of the mass disturbances. The Uzbek KGB has, of course, assisted prosecutor's office staffers with all the forces and means at our disposal in investigating these events. Literally from the 1st day of the events an operations staff at the Fergana Oblast KGB Administration, comprising leaders of the republic's KGB and the oblast administration, mounted intensive around-the-clock work. The best qualified USSR and Uzbek SSR KGB investigators and operational personnel were sent to Fergana. Precise cooperation was organized with party, soviet, and law-enforcement organs and the command of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Troops. Army General F.D. Bobkov, first deputy chairman of the USSR KGB, who visited the republic, saw the situation on the spot and examined a number of organizational questions, and all questions that arise with regard to the organization of joint work are resolved immediately by the USSR KGB leadership, which promptly directs the staff's activity and offers us any necessary assistance and support in a timely fashion.

Investigative operations groups comprising personnel from the USSR Prosecutor's Office, the MVD, and the KGB are operating in Fergana Oblast today—they include approximately 50 highly experienced staffers of state security organs. These officers have vigorously joined in operational investigative work and investigative operations. They have exposed and conveyed to prosecutor's office organs a large quantity of data regarding specific individuals who are justifiably suspected of involvement in pogroms, arson, killings, and acts of vandalism. A considerable quantity of material relating to individuals involved in manufacturing home-made weapons, petrol bombs, and other objects that rampaging thugs used to commit crimes has also been handed over. Many automobiles whose drivers—willingly or under threat—transported the pogromists around Fergana Oblast have been found.

In the last 2 weeks or more KGB officials along with militia staffers and MVD Internal Troops servicemen have confiscated from the population a large quantity of illegal firearms, edged weapons, ammunition, petrol bombs, spiked clubs, sharpened pieces of steel, and other dangerous objects with which the extremists were armed during the mass disturbances. At the same time Uzbek KGB and Fergana Oblast KGB Administration personnel took steps designed to ensure the normal working of industrial enterprises, institutions, educational establishments, municipal transport, and facilities providing the population with vital services, prevent any sabotage or wrecking by the pogromists, and relieve tension in labor collectives.

At present the republic's state security organs are giving party, soviet, and law-enforcement organs specific assistance in carrying out preventive, explanatory, and mass agitation work. It is no secret that individual residents in the republic sometimes spread panicmongering, provocative rumors, and groundless fabrications which deliberately or otherwise help preserve tension. Therefore security personnel see one of their tasks today as being to provide all manner of assistance in suppressing such rumors in a timely fashion, exposing the malicious rumormongers, and explaining to the broad public the bankruptcy and provocativeness of such fabrications.

The fact that KGB staffers firmly rely in their activity on aid and support from the broadest strata of working people, without which the work of state security organs would be totally unsuccessful, must also be underlined. I must say that this aid is becoming increasingly effective and vigorous every day. Owing to the courage and resolute civic stance adopted by hundreds of honest Soviet people, we have managed to obtain and hand over to investigative operation groups a considerable quantity of material which sheds light on many episodes in the events in Fergana and on the true role played by a considerable number of the people directly involved in them, and to largely form a pool of witnesses [svidetelskaya baza], which is acutely necessary today in order to carry out a comprehensive and objective investigation. This work will continue at most strenuous rates until every single organizer, participant, perpetrator, activist, and rabble-rouser involved in the mass disturbances in Fergana Oblast has been exposed and has met his just deserts.

Of course, no one thinks that this tremendous painstaking work will be completed in a few days or even weeks. For every specific case must be investigated most thoroughly, without deviating from the requirements of socialist legality at all. Thus much complex work still lies ahead, requiring considerable effort, presence of mind, calm, and great professionalism.

Politburo's Chebrikov Tours Lipetsk Oblast

PM1207110189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 89 Second Edition p3

[TASS report: "Deepening Perestroyka by Practical Deeds"]

[Text] Metallurgists know well how steel is tempered. The metal is all the stronger and purer, the more human labor, knowledge, and experience goes into it. The same is true of our party. It draws its strength from the collective intellect and from the moral purity and conviction of every Communist. Its journey is difficult and largely through unknown territory. Having bravely admitted the mistakes of the past, the party has become the initiator of perestroyka and a force for revolutionary renewal in Soviet society.

This is no chance analogy. It is the result of impressions from a meeting which took place at the carbon steel cold rolling mill of the Novolipetsk metallurgical combine between V.M. Chebrikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and D.Ya. Zhikharev, senior rolling-press operator in the sheet rolling facility. The opinions of the participants in the dialogue coincided: One of the leaders of the CPSU and an ordinary worker were unanimous that perestroyka is tempering the party and that its program of democratization and glasnost guarantees the irreversibility of the renewal processes.

V.M. Chebrikov was in Lipetsk 5-8 July. Before he left Moscow, we asked him what had prompted his trip. After all, Viktor Mikhaylovich was not elected people's deputy from this city. Perhaps this trip by the chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Commission on Questions of Legal Policy was connected with this aspect of his activities?

"I am a deputy from the CPSU," came the reply. "And I feel it my duty to explain party policy at local level. Lipetsk is a major center of the metallurgical industry. A large detachment of highly skilled workers and technical intelligentsia works here. I am trained as a metallurgist myself, and this makes my forthcoming visit particularly interesting."

This belief was borne out in the very first minutes of his arrival at the Novolipetsk Yu.V. Andropov metallurgical combine. His acquaintance with the enterprise began at the sixth blast furnace. The unit's equipment is impressive. The scientific and technical achievements of metallurgy were used when it was designed. Talking about this, Yu.V. Savastyanov, acting chief of the blast furnace shop, said that the designers and the plant's specialists set themselves the aim of achieving a high level of automation and mechanization, making fuller use of a by-product from the smelting process—scoria—and ensuring a highly productive, reliable performance by the machinery. They have succeeded in this.

The guest inquired about the working conditions of the blast furnace attendants and other service personnel who work at the iron tap holes and casting pits.

Life as a metallurgical worker is hard. Not without reason, it is said that they are craftsmen of fire.

"Approximately 400 young engineers and technicians come to our combine every year," A.I. Teplenichev, secretary of the enterprise's party committee, said. "This year we commissioned a new block of the metallurgical technical school. As you can see, the equipment here can only be operated by highly qualified specialists."

"And what kind of housing are they provided with?" V.M. Chebrikov wondered.

"We have drawn up a comprehensive housing program," I.V. Frantsenyuk, the director of the combine, said, joining in the conversation. "This year alone, we have already commissioned 9,152 square meters against the planned figure of 6,400. What is more, we have acquired a large area in the suburban settlement of Dachnyy for individual builders. It is now being assimilated. However, despite this, the housing problem remains tense. This is not helping to increase the prestige of the metallurgical profession."

Workers and specialists at the combine noted with concern that it has become difficult to ensure a full complement of sinter blast furnace operators, steel smelters, and coal-tar chemical specialists.

"We are aware of this," the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said. "Intensive work is under way in the country to improve cadre policy. Naturally, this process will also affect metallurgy."

But there is also another important point—to increase responsibility for work. An interesting conversation on this subject unexpectedly arose at the "2000" rolling mill. This is one of the largest installations in Soviet industry. Almost 1,000 tonnes of metal are produced here every hour. A substantial proportion of welded pipes for major oil and gas pipelines are made from the sheet metal rolled at the "2000" rolling mill.

"Accidents along main pipelines have become more frequent recently," V.M. Chebrikov said, addressing workshop specialists. "What is more, when we begin to establish the causes, we find that the fracture is not on the seam but runs through the metal, so to speak. Do you know how your pipes are used?"

"According to our statistics, in the last 10 years Lipetsk metal has not been to blame for a single accident," engineer A.V. Melnikov replied. "We now carry out more stringent checks 'at the factory gates,' using ultrasound and other advanced control methods."

"But what about the accident in Bashkiria? Was that section not made of your metal? Have you tried to find out?" came the question.

"Not yet, unfortunately," his interlocutor made a helpless gesture. "But we definitely will."

"Make sure you do—this concerns your professional honor."

Another subject raised was ecology. A worried conversation about this started up of its own accord at the gates of the converter unit. Hosts and guests took note of a long, orange cloud hanging over the combine.

"That, unfortunately, is still an inevitable result of the technological process at the moment when the cast iron enters the converter," G.N. Roldugin, chief of the oxygen steel-making converter unit, explained. "There is no absolutely clean metallurgical enterprise anywhere in the world. Science and advanced engineering are conducting active research. And we, too, are working in this direction."

"But people cannot wait too long," V.M. Chebrikov remarked. "The combine must make its ecological program more intensive. You are building a fine city, and the skies above it must be clean."

All the conversations the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee had were conducted in this way—through the prism of people's interests. One such conversation was with representatives of the metallurgical combine's labor collectives. The meeting began with a thorough analysis of the situation in the oblast.

The Central Committee, V.M. Chebrikov said, believes that the Lipetsk Oblast party committee (obkom), city party committees (gorkoms), rayon party committees (raykoms), and primary party organizations on the whole now have a stronger influence on the processes of socioeconomic development in the oblast. The work of party bodies has become more specific, efficient, and intolerant of shortcomings. New approaches to the solution of urgent problems are being actively sought.

It is gratifying to note that the rate of growth of commodity output and labor productivity achieved in industry is higher than planned in the current 5-year period. There has been considerable growth in output in the agro-industrial complex and this is due to no small extent to the oblast party organization.

At the same time, the speaker said, the potential accumulated by the oblast's national economy is certainly not being used to the full. Acute problems connected with the social infrastructure are only slowly being resolved. The fact that in the last 3 years fixed industrial assets have grown by 17.9 percent while the return on assets has fallen by 2.1 percent cannot fail to cause concern. Technological discipline at enterprises is still poor and losses from shoddy workmanship have increased.

A lively discussion of the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies is continuing in Lipetsk Oblast, as in the rest of the country. Talking about the results of the congress, V.M. Chebrikov stressed that, for all the diversity of appraisals of the congress, the one that rightly predominates is that it was the most impressive event in perestroyka and the clearest, most convincing sign of the scale of the changes taking place in our country. Of course, there were attempts at the congress to make the discussion one of confrontation and to divert it from the main issues. Some deputies were lacking in political sophistication. But these factors did not shape the face of the forum. On the whole, the congress worked out a united political stand based on the desire to actively advance the process of renewing society. It laid the foundations for establishing a new mechanism of political power.

The party went to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies with a program for deepening perestroyka, which is constantly being elaborated and added to. The CPSU Central Committee April (1989) Plenum was undoubtedly useful in this respect. It analyzed the situation in the party and the country on the eve of the congress and gave it a fundamental political assessment. The party is not satisfied with the present state of affairs in the economy and has frankly said so. It shares the working people's dissatisfaction caused by the deterioration in the situation in the domestic market, the shortage of consumer goods, flaws in cooperative activity, and disruptions in trade, even in those goods produced in perfectly adequate quantities. It feels that the criticism levelled at local and central party, soviet, and economic bodies is justified. Including criticism addressed to the CPSU Central Committee, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and the USSR Council of Ministers. If it intends to retain the role of the political vanguard of society, the party is simply bound to take a critical attitude to its own activity and have the courage to accept the criticism given to it. This position is the norm for any ruling political party and particularly for our country's communist party—the party of the revolutionary renewal of society.

Another noteworthy feature of the Lipetsk meetings was that conversations which in the recent past traditionally took the form of a lecture have now become extremely open and confiding. People have lost their inhibitions, willingly talk about matters of concern to them, and offer their own solutions to urgent problems.

The discussion at the Lipetsk machine tool manufacturing plant and at the "House of Bread," a new, fully automated bakery enterprise, took this tone.

Everything was a source of interest to the guests: They wanted to know how transport, consumer, and food supply problems are being resolved. The metallurgical combine, which has a large subsidiary farm, is significant in this respect. One of its subdivisions is a fish products unit. Here, in artificial conditions, in an area of several thousand square meters, almost 300 tonnes of carp are raised per year. Alongside, there stands a kiosk with a sign saying "Fresh fish." A considerable amount of the fish goes to the workers' canteens and so the metallurgical workers' menu is becoming more varied.

Similar vital problems were the subject of a detailed discussion between the Central Committee secretary and workers in the mechanics section of the machine tool manufacturing plant in the break between shifts. Complaints of poor working conditions have become common at many enterprises.

"We are now tackling these problems," A.A. Khripunkov, chairman of the enterprise's council of team leaders, member of the CPSU obkom, and milling machine operator, said. "Our plant's food store is very popular. There is now no need to hurry to the city food store after work. Everything you need for the dinner table can be bought without leaving the plant's premises."

The return on these initiatives is great. The plant is making confident headway.

"We manufacture high-precision surface grinders and cooperate with well- known firms in developed capitalist countries," V.I. Nisenman, director of the enterprise, said. "In order to trade, we need foreign currency. The enterprise is capable of generating that currency. But for this we need greater independence and a faster pace of retooling."

Talking with workers at the enterprise, V.M. Chebrikov stressed the importance of the work they are doing and the significance of machine tool manufacture for retooling Soviet industry.

The fate of perestroyka and economic reform concerns everyone. They have been discussed in the last few days and the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee has been asked dozens of questions. The answers to these questions demanded maximum frankness. People were interested in the problems of interethnic relations, progress with drafting laws and creating a rule-of-law state, and in the cooperative movement. The questions asked ranged across the whole diversity of life—from the shortage of some consumer goods to the country's defense capability. And none of these questions went unanswered.

The subject of combating crime came up very frequently. The active stand taken by the audience is understandable. Criminal statistics have been made public. Citizens are alarmed by rising crime.

How is law and order to be safeguarded? Where should we begin? Pondering these questions, V.M. Chebrikov stressed that the main causes of crime are rooted in the serious economic and social ills with which our society is stricken.

Fighting crime is not the sole responsibility of law enforcement bodies—it is also the concern of all party, soviet, and social organizations, the concern of all society. As long as we do not forget this, cleansing our lives of all filth will be a more rapid process. This conclusion was also reached at a conference with leaders of the oblast's law enforcement bodies.

V.M. Chebrikov also had a meeting with the party and economic aktiv and secretaries of CPSU gorkoms and raykoms. Considerable attention was devoted to the role of primary organizations in the task of perestroyka. Political methods are being moved to the center of all work, V.M. Chebrikov said. The essence of these methods lies in the kind of party influence on processes which rules out petty tutelage and interference in practical matters. Based on democratic principles, a scientific approach, and consideration of public opinion, they address people's minds and are designed to shape inner motives of conduct and action. In short, political methods of leadership make it possible to conduct party policy through persuasion and work thoughtfully with people. This is now the most important point.

...The three days allotted for the visit to Lipetsk could not accommodate the whole diversity of meetings. The schedule of businesslike contacts had to be extended by another day. V.M. Chebrikov was accompanied on his visits to the enterprises by Yu.A. Manayenkov, first secretary of the Lipetsk CPSU Obkom, and V.V. Donskikh, chairman of the oblast soviet executive committee.

The trip to Lipetsk is now over. We asked Viktor Mikhaylovich to give his opinion on the visit. He said:

"We have seen the great potential of Lipetsk Oblast in the industrial, agricultural, and social spheres. There is a strong oblast party organization. A great deal of work is being done. We have come away feeling confident that the difficulties will be overcome and the plans achieved."

Deputy Elaborates on Gorbachev TV Speech

18001336 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Jul 89 First Edition p 3

[Interview with B.Ye. Paton, member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, by M. Odinets, PRAVDA correspondent: "Tribune of a People's Deputy": "Not Simply a Large Family"; date and place of interview not given; first paragraph is an introduction]

[Text] **We listened with great interest the other day to the speech of M.S. Gorbachev on Central Television. It affected everyone in some way. The problems it touched on were also considered during congressional discussions. B.Ye. Paton was an active participant in the congress, and our interview with him is interlaced with questions that were mentioned in M.S. Gorbachev's speech.**

[Odinets] Serious contradictions, whose sources are the epoch of the cult of personality and the long period of stagnation that followed it, were revealed recently in international relations, including their economic sphere. In your opinion, is there a real basis for the constructive resolution of international problems and for raising them to a new qualitative level?

[Paton] It has to be said that the former type of relations of peoples who are part of the Union of the SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] have already lost the ability to cement our unity reliably. All of us have now become convinced of the inadmissibility of euphoria and pride with respect to the successes of our ethnic policy, not only actual but imaginary as well. And the main thing is the intolerability of hushing up negative trends in the development of interethnic relations which, as life has shown, were by no means without problems and which were nourished by the general atmosphere of stagnation, group and ethnic egoism, and the dictates of the center and narrow local interests....

[Odinets] Boris Yevgenevich, forces already exist in some republics that have rather loudly declared themselves and that are fighting for ethnic isolation and even withdrawal from the structure of the Union of the SSR. Speculating on ethnic feelings and resentments that occurred as a result of distortions of Leninist ethnic policy, they are trying actually to utilize the expansion of democracy and glasnost for anti-national purposes. It is not difficult to imagine where the demands of these extremist-oriented forces will lead. Once torn away from the structure of the multi-ethnic union of the state, individual republics, especially the small ones, would be faced with numerous difficulties and problems. What do you think is the most advisable path here?

[Paton] There are really many problems here. Today, when public practice disclosed many contradictions and conflicting situations that have not been resolved for decades, there is a pressing need to search for specific ways and methods of eliminating tensions that have built up. Naturally, by adhering to the legal interests of each ethnic group as an important condition of their future joint development in the structure of a single family of socialist republics. Because our union is not just a family, but something more, immeasurably more, and this has to be valued.

It is known, for example, that, in the all-union division of labor, the Ukraine is assigned a role as one of the main fuel energy, metallurgical, and machine building bases of the country. The republic is responsible for about half of all production of cast iron, 40 percent of the steel and rolled products, one-third of the coal extraction, and almost 60 percent of the iron ore. A fifth of the grain, about half of the sugar and vegetable oil, and many other products. In turn, the Ukraine receives oil and oil products, nonferrous metals, apatite, power equipment, machines, lumber, textiles, paper, cotton, etc. So that practically every article of Ukranian industry has a portion of labor of all regions of the country.

The science of the Soviet Ukraine is also an inherent constituent part of a single Soviet science. Its academic institutes, which have achieved an increase in the efficiency of research, participate in a whole number of important directions in union and republic programs, and they collaborate on a contractual basis with enterprises in other republics.

The entire brisk practice of cooperation of the national republics, despite deficiencies and costs, provides rich material for developing a sound basis for our voluntary unification. All that is needed is desire, the desire to build and not to destroy.

[Odinets] As many people's deputies said at the congress, the present and future of all peoples of our country are not in their dissociation, but in their cohesion and unity....

[Paton] Yes, that is the objective trend which is now dominant in the development of the world community, affecting not only economics, but politics and the sphere of the state structure as well. Not to see this is to display complete shortsightedness, and to nudge people into risky decisions that are perilous to their historic destiny. Let us look at the experience of Western Europe, where the processes of economic and political integration have moved rather far. Despite the capitalist form of this process, there is reason to assert that participation in the European Economic Community will bring quite a few benefits to states that are part of it. There is also a place for inter-state rapprochement, which is evident in the elections to the European parliament. The idea of the creation of an "all-European home" is making headway today in current policy.

The activity of persons who are entrusted with the political leadership of the republics and the country as a whole must be sufficiently flexible in order not to bring matters to a confrontation. The main element must be an honest, open, and, mainly, a timely dialogue. But if a crisis situation still develops, then it has to be resolved by political means exclusively. Especially because it is our country that is the initiator of affirming such an approach in the international arena.

[Odinets] A lot was said at the congress about republic cost accounting. Your opinion?...

[Paton] It is clear to everyone today that the harmonization of ethnic relations is possible only on a firm economic foundation. It is time for us to engage earnestly in a study of the correlation of states and societies, regional and personal interests in social and economic spheres, the degree of their satisfaction, and the influence of non-equivalent exchanges in interethnic relations.

[Odinets] But the ministries and department with their dictates?...

[Paton] It can be said confidently that the current tension in interethnic relations in many ways is caused by the monopolism of the all-powerful departments that command the basic industries of the national economy and which thereby completely control the economies of the union republics. Using their dominant position in the economy, they frequently neglect the interests of the republics and regions. They confront them with the accomplished facts of approved decisions, ignoring the specific conditions and prospects for development, and the opinions of the broad mass of workers. All of this taken together is an intense source of dissatisfaction with the activities of the center, the nurturing environment in which the sources of current and future conflicts are formed.

[Odinets] What is the solution?

[Paton] In my view, on the one hand, the soviets of people's deputies must become genuine masters on their own territories and have real authority. On the other hand, it is clear that there have to be significantly fewer industrial ministries—these relics of an administrative command system that is becoming a thing of the past reluctantly—and that their rights have to be brought into conformity with the new political-economic realities. It is understandable that a determination of prerogatives is not a simple matter. The new character of their mutual relationships with enterprises, whose independence and rights are being broadened substantially in the course of economic reform, has to be taken into complete account. Life demonstrates convincingly that the ministries must not maintain a monopoly position in their traditional "patrimonies"—the industries.

[Odinets] Apparently, enterprises of a union subordination should get rid of the dictatorial manners that were characteristic of them in the past?

[Paton] Without fail. Henceforth, mutual relations with the soviets will have to be built not on the basis of power pressure but, relying on dialogue and persuasion, on the strong evidence of accounts and computations. Priority should belong to the soviets of people's deputies in the resolution of all questions that affect the interests of regions. The broadening of the rights of the soviets, while retaining the supreme authority of industrial ministries and the industrial giants, is nothing more than an illusion.

The foundation of more independence for the republic and local soviets, undoubtedly, is regional economic management. As a mechanism for managing the economy of a republic and inter-republic ties, it must become a catalyst for initiative and enterprise.

[Odinets] What is the main thing in the transition to republic cost accounting?

[Paton] I think that two principal questions come to the forefront here. The first is a radical restructuring of the budgetary system, a decentralization of its formation, and a decisive shift of the proportion of the redistribution of income in favor of the republics and localities. Only the budget can be the framework of regional cost accounting. It is its main element. It is only through the budget and on its basis that territorial cost acounting can be realized.

The crux of another very important question of republic cost accounting is in assuring equivalency in the mutual relations of republics with the center and also among themselves. Expansion of the economic independence of the union republics should be implemented on the principles of flexibility and voluntariness. The principle of compulsory comparison of the income and expenditure parts of republic budgets and their open formation by democratically elected organs of authority must be common to all of them, taking into account the economic, political, and ethnic features of each of them.

[Odinets] Many deputies complained about state orders that are issued by the center....

[Paton] State orders and centralized purchases should not lead to uncompensated infringement on market funds of commodities and foodstuffs in the republics and oblasts. It is impossible to measure income and expenditures by throwing everything together in one pot. But this is precisely the way in which we commited abuses in the period of stagnation, and this engendered tension and friction in ethnic relations. Naturally, there were those who were really offended by the unequal participation in the inter-republic distribution of consumption funds. An end has to be put to this. Consumer opportunities should conform strictly to the amount and quality of labor expended by the population. Regional cost accounting is called on to ensure this very thing.

At the same time, while supporting a universal expansion of the independence of the republics, one should not go to extremes and try to place all socially necessary functions on them. There is no doubt that the realization of a number of such functions at a republic level is either impossible or obviously ineffective. This concerns, first and foremost, the defense of the country, foreign relations, state security, ecology, and, of course, state scientific-technical policy.

In my opinion, the transition to cost accounting, the expansion of the rights of enterprises and organizations, the creation of various innovative funds and banks, the development of intermediary activity on commercial principles, and other elements of decentralization in the scientific-production sphere not only do not lower but to a large extent raise the significance of a single scientific-technical policy drawn up on a nationwide level. This is evidenced in the experience of the developed countries that have economies that are market-oriented.

[Odinets] And what place is assigned here to science?

[Paton] If one is speaking strictly about science, then one should keep in mind that intensification of the independence of the republics and regional cost accounting can lead to, and are already leading to, deformations in the distribution of resources for basic research and applied development. This, in particular, is contributed to by the imperfection of the recently published draft "General Principles of Restructuring of the Management of the Economic and Social Sphere in the Union Republics on the Basis of Broadening Their Sovereign Rights, Self-Management, and Self-Financing." It lacks statements about the national significance of basic scientific research, and the necessity for their priority development in all union republics. This makes it possible for republic organs to arbitrarily redistribute appropriations that were allocated from the union budget. Naturally, work that promises immediate profit is supported at the expense of basic research. This cannot help but cause serious concern. It seems that appropriations from the union budget for science should be fully utilized according to purpose without their redistribution by republic organs. On the other hand, to the extent possible, union republics could provide additional means for financing basic and applied research and development that are important to the development of a region. In other words, the dictate of the center must not be replaced by the dictate of a republic.

[Odinets] Will this not weaken the integrative ties in the framework of a single Soviet science?

[Paton] Yes, strengthening the independence of the republics could bring about a weakening of these ties. However, in the final analysis, everything will be determined by the extent that a realistic approach prevails in republic organs, excluding isolationism in science as well as in other spheres of our daily lives. The centripetal tendencies should prevail over centrifugal tendencies. This, of course, does not denote the supremacy of the state over the periphery.

Of course, the spheres of competence of the union and republic organs should be clearly demarcated. If we would like our science-intense production, let us say, to meet the level of competing American and Japanese products, then their nomenclature should not be planned in Moscow. The structure of modern production should be flexible and mobile. And this requires great independence of localities from the union center.

All of this does not negate but presumes the necessity for jointly coordinated efforts, first and foremost in the priority directions of scientific-technical progress. I am confident that the future development of various detachments of Soviet science will follow precisely this path.

Close creative ties and the interaction of scientists do not in any way infringe on the ethnic interests and sovereignty of the republics. They are mutually beneficial, providing that they are placed on a sound footing. This also applies to the ties of science with production. In our academy, for example, more than half of the scientific-technical innovations introduced in the last 5 years are attributable to other republics. I will also add to this that, outside the Ukraine, the USSR Academy of Sciences has established 18 inculcation strongpoints for the accelerated introduction of the developments of its institutes in enterprises of the Russian Federation, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kirgiziya, and Moldaviya. And they function, as the saying goes, not at a loss.... It is important only that, during the introduction, favorable prerequisites are created for the stimulation both of the scientists and the producers. Cost accounting will create a good basis for this, with the avaiability, naturally, of highly effective developments.

Undoubtedly, amalgamation of the efforts of scientists of different republics and their scientific-technical cooperation will bring, and they should bring, their own fruit in the future, and to destroy all of this in the name of the imaginary advantages of ethnic distancing and isolation would be irrational at the very least. The future of Soviet science, and its progress and prosperity, are possible only by way of unity and cohesion.

Deputy Views Party, State Apparatus Privileges

PM1207122589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 89 p 2

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy Viktor Nikolayevich Yaroshenko by economic observer Pavel Voshchanov: "Privileges"; date and place of interview not given]

[Text] [Voshchanov] The call was repeatedly heard at the congress that all privileges and benefits established for party and state apparatus workers be repealed immediately! Objections usually followed in response: There are no special privileges and any talk about them is pursuing a far from innocuous aim—driving a wedge between the working people and the leadership and sowing distrust toward the authorities among the people. Where does the truth lie? And where is the dividing line between the desire to level down and the habit of a "personal" life?

[Yaroshenko] In my opinion it was the leveling down which gave rise to the "personal" life. Let's turn to history: Where did it all begin? Seemingly with the noble idea of building a society in which everyone would have an equal sufficiency.... It is hard to say now if that was an error, an illusion, or a tactical ploy on the part of politicians who understood how much the idea of "equality in poverty" impresses the underprivileged majority. One thing is obvious: Leveling down began to be perceived by the broadest masses as the supreme socialist ideal and became the pivot of state policy. But human labor cannot be homogenous and from the very first steps leveled down remuneration for it began to hold back social progress because the incentive to professional and not only professional growth had disappeared. What do we do? Renounce leveling down? But what about the "socialist ideals" which had been proclaimed and were being propagandized everywhere? It was then that the compromise was born between the utopian idea and common sense: preserving formal, apparent equality in wages but introducing special state benefits for some categories of workers particularly important to the state.

[Voshchanov] And if we are speaking of the top management apparatus, were the reasons for the emergence of privileges the same here?

[Yaroshenko] Of course. Although there is one specific feature. First, the benefits, compensating for the low wages of the managers, were designed to create a kind of illusion among the population: that the apparatus workers were living just as modestly as the entire people and that their aspirations and concerns were therefore close to them. But inasmuch as not everyone believed that myth, then for the "overinformed" population benefits were to demonstrate the special importance of work in the apparatus.

[Voshchanov] Much has changed in our society since then. Why have official privileges survived intact to our day?

[Yaroshenko] The reasons for leveling down have not been eliminated nor, consequently, have the privileges. One reason is the underpayment of our labor. At a press conference organized recently for Soviet and foreign correspondents, USSR People's Deputy G.S. Lisichkin cited the following figures: One hour of labor in Switzerland costs about $30 on average, in the FRG $28, in France $15, while in the USSR it costs less than $1. That is how cheap labor turns out to be in our country! You can imagine that apparatus workers, like all of us, are underpaid. In our country a minister receives R800 a month and a shop chief at a good plant also gets R800. But surely the strenuousness of their work and their degree of responsibility cannot be compared? Of course not. The work of a statesman is not valued so cheaply in any other country. And at the same time there is nowhere else where a minister receives so many additional benefits over and above his salary! Yet virtually the ENTIRE working population and not only those at the helm of management is in need of compensation for underpaid labor.

[Voshchanov] The result is that abolishing official privileges is less important than making them accessible to all?

[Yaroshenko] Strictly speaking, yes. And the very concept of "privileges" will then disappear. But in the present economic situation this task is unrealistic and a question of an ethical order arises: Is it moral to enjoy privileges while the population is literally suffocating in the clutches of endless shortages? When there are so many unresolved problems in the social sphere? When there is a shortage of funds for the implementation of even the most pressing programs? My opinion is that it is immoral.

[Voshchanov] Leveling down is an economic phenomenon. Does that mean that the system of departmental services can be eliminated only by economic methods?

[Yaroshenko] I do not think that we should struggle against departmentalism in the distribution of benefits but against exclusiveness! Under the conditions of the radical economic reform, when self-management and self-financing are becoming increasingly widespread, the system of departmental social security will develop vigorously. In the country today there are already hundreds of these systems including their own hospitals and polyclinics, kindergartens and creches, rest homes and sanatoriums, culture centers, and dacha cooperatives. And that is right, after all, the level of social benefits should depend to a great degree on the overall results of the work of the enterprise, collective farm [kolkhoz], or institute.

[Voshchanov] If party and state institutions, like all others in our country, have the right to their own services systems, where then is the problem?

[Yaroshenko] In the fact that today, under the conditions of very acute shortage, many social benefits absolutely inaccessible to the overwhelming majority of citizens, thanks to the systems of "closed" special services become the possession of only selected strata of society. I have in mind apartment blocks constructed to special plans and state dachas, food rations and special subscription, special services and reservations, personal automobiles and "deputies'" halls, a special network of rest homes and sanatoriums, hospitals and pharmacies, kindergartens and polyclinics. Essentially a system of dual existence has taken shape in the country.

[Voshchanov] And nonetheless.... It is not only leading workers who enjoy many of the benefits you listed. Large enterprises, for instance, also construct their own apartment blocks and open hospitals and polyclinics. Their workers acquire food products through the plant's order counters....

[Yaroshenko] That story is a long way from the truth. Surely a food order for a responsible worker in a government institution and, for instance, a factory worker cannot be compared. The former can indeed choose from a most impressive list which would make anyone dizzy uninitiated to the secrets of apparatus services. And the latter? He is obliged to take only what he is given. And the quality of the food is utterly incomparable. After all it is no secret that to this day there exist food shops and even whole enterprises which produce food products solely for a "closed network."

[Voshchanov] It is said that the expression "having a shopping bag" is common among our bureaucrats. That means enjoying the right to order foods from special lists.

[Yaroshenko] That expression does exist in apparatus "folklore." The nomenklatura "shopping bag"—far from all apparatus workers, only the apparatus' leading personnel, enjoy this right—is a kind of yardstick of official prosperity and success. The higher an employee is, the heavier the "shopping bag." But that does not exhaust the problem....

Together with privileges, a far more serious social danger has sneaked up on us imperceptibly and gradually—the exploitation of the majority by the minority, and in a hitherto unknown form. In my opinion, the term "social injustice" is too delicate for this phenomenon. I realize that the danger of nomenklatura privileges may seem a blatant exaggeration to some people. But what would you call a situation in which the leading minority draws from the public stock benefits inaccessible to the majority which created them? I am sure that benefits connected not with labor but purely with the fact of being in a particular post are a specific form of unearned income. They are obtained through the enforced redistribution of the national income without the consent of those who created most of them. And in that sense they contain a factor which delays the leadership's adoption of the correct decisions in the interests of the majority, that is the implementation of the policy of perestroyka.

[Voshchanov] Is it that complex to abolish privileges if they entail a danger to reforms? Ultimately we do not have that many leaders enjoying them....

[Yaroshenko] Not many? Benefits and privileges have led to the social stratification of society. An entirely specific stratum which I would call by one word—an elite—has appeared, strengthened, and acquired the ability to develop itself. Joining its ranks, becoming related to it, or serving it has become the main purpose in life for many people.

The privileges of those who are at the very top inevitably make those a rung below want to acquire them. Official benefits are mimicked at virtually any level. And the lower the level, the more absurd, antisocial and, if you like, antipopular they are. So what kind of a phenomenon is this in our life? I have one answer—distorted morality. And its consequences can be very sad. Is it not a fact that the leaders who in rank are a long way from officially established privileges but who want to obtain them often enter into contact with the trade and service mafia and organize "local self service?" The payment for that is the patronage of the "shadow economy." It is on this basis that there forms around the black market a powerful defensive circle to which representatives of the party, soviet, economic, and even law enforcement organs are enlisted. And another factor. The system of privileges is dangerous in that it corrupts not only those who officially enjoy it but also those who ensure these privileges. They are the hundreds of people employed in the sphere of "nomenklatura" servicing. And it must be admitted that today they have no interest at all in abolishing this pernicious system because they derive most tangible advantages from it.

[Voshchanov] In brief, it is time to draw the following conclusion: However difficult it may be we must seek the speediest abolition of all privileges.

[Yaroshenko] And long live...leveling down?! That after all will lead to at least two undesirable consequences. First, "nature abhors a vacuum." Instead of those who receive privileges "according to regulations," goods and services in short supply will be seized by those who can pay a good price for them—criminals who have grown rich on speculation, bribes, and machinations. They will be the first into the breach formed after the abolition of official privileges. Is that not confirmed by the sorry example of hotels, automobile servicing, and restaurants which today have been purchased literally as they stand by "hemp," "cotton," "citrus," "flower," "vegetable," "furniture," and other "kings?" In addition the trade and service mafia is beginning persistently to offer its services to leaders deprived of their privileges in exchange, of course, for protection and defense from the law enforcement organs. The damage to the country as a result of this "alliance" is far greater than from the privileges themselves.

[Voshchanov] But what other method can be used to resolve the problem? So far I am hearing only of two options: retaining privileges or abolishing them.

[Yaroshenko] I think there are more options. I agree that some privileges should be abolished immediately. Others should be preserved but they should be made paid privileges and should be based on fair assessments. The abolition of others should entail some monetary compensation to apparatus workers. Ultimately it is neither normal, economical, nor scientific that a leader and an ordinary worker should receive the same wage. In developed countries a director earns 5, 10, or even 20 times more than a worker. Yet thanks to scientific and economic relations "their" worker receives more than "our" minister. But in any case we cannot heal this social ill on impulse, from positions of an emotional interpretation of it. That path does not lead to success. It is time finally to learn to act from positions of sensible economy.

[Voshchanov] Oh, I fear many of our readers will not support that idea....

[Yaroshenko] They will not. But what can you do. We are all beset by shortages and we have grown tired of the endless lines. We want at least some rapid and tangible relief. In that situation there is a great temptation to win sympathies by calling for the immediate and unconditional abolition of all official privileges. But I am sure that we must not end the "privilege economy" in such a way that the "shadow economy" complacently flourishes and strengthens as a result.

[Voshchanov] Over a year ago it was decided to reduce the number of personal automobiles by 40 percent. Public opinion supported that step. But here is what puts us on our guard: At the entrances to our departments there are no fewer automobiles and drivers dozing in them are just as common a phenomenon. Yet the statistics say that the number of personal automobiles has indeed been reduced.

[Yaroshenko] Edict methods of struggling against privilege are in general ineffective. The bureaucrat has a reserve of numerous conceivable and inconceivable methods of fulfilling the most radical decision while changing nothing. Economic measures are needed? What methods? Those who have driver's licenses and are healthy must be given the right to use an automobile when he gets behind the wheel. For that, it is true, we must abolish some restrictions, for instance the demand that the vehicle be returned to the state garage for the night. The following option is also possible: Selling personal automobiles entirely to those who "according to regulations" can make use of them. But what if a leader already has his own vehicle? Then we must provide for money compensation for gasoline and technical servicing. It is expedient to use everything which could reduce the social stratum for whom the state coffers pay for "a coach and coachman."

[Voshchanov] Some people imagine the problem like this: There is a dispute between those who have been deprived of some privileges or other but see all their unfairness and those who enjoy these privileges extensively but cannot and do not want to renounce the pleasures of a "personal" life. Is that so?

[Yaroshenko] Not quite. In actual fact the problem is far more complex! For instance, it is obvious to me that over many decades a ramified and multilevel system of numerous privileges, unique of its kind, has taken shape in our country. And it is not only nomenklatura privileges. Inhabitants of Moscow also have an advantage over the inhabitants of many other cities in the country where no meat, salami, or sausages appear on sale and cheese is a rarity. And the person working abroad? He has a far higher living standard than all other Soviet citizens, although he has perhaps invested the same amount of labor. And there are many such examples. Today the "weight" of the earned ruble depends on whose hands it is in. The main injustice lies precisely there! Here is the reason why a Soviet minister receives a smaller salary than a skilled worker in Sweden or Canada. But in contrast to his Swedish or Canadian colleague he will never meet with a worker in "his own" store. The struggle against social injustice should begin with the struggle for economic justice. And depriving a leader of the "quit rent" ["obrok"] that is demeaning to us should be accompanied by an increase in the "force of gravity" of the honestly earned Soviet ruble. Earned not ex officio but according to a person's services.

Spokesman Criticizes Inaccuracies in Swiss Paper

LD0108213189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1515 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow, 1 Aug (TASS)—TASS correspondent Nikita Demidov reports:

Criticism was directed at the Swiss newspaper TAGES ANZEIGER, which distorted information provided at a briefing at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, by Boris Mikhaylov, chief of that ministry's press service, today.

He stated that on 22 July 1989 the newspaper published two dispatches under the headlines, "Even in Kazakhstan Economic Problems Have Become the Cause of Social Conflicts" and "Appalling Rise in Crime." To judge by the content, Mikhaylov noted, the correspondent was using material from a briefing held at the USSR Interior Ministry's press center on 13 June 1989. The author, Mikhaylov believes, was tactless with regard to the Kazakh people by claiming that the acts of violence which occurred in the town of Novyy Uzen had turned into interethnic enmity. "There was no ethnic cause underlying" the way the conflict arose, the spokesman for the USSR Interior Ministry stressed. It is enough to state that at the time of the events in Novyy Uzen, the native population in the south of the republic were taking into their homes refugees from Fergana Oblast in Uzbekistan—the Meskhetian Turks.

Boris Mikhaylov also noted the journalists's free treatment of figures describing the state of organized crime in the USSR. "Citing a statement by a spokesman for the USSR Interior Ministry," Mikhaylov stressed, "the author claims that the organized criminal world has sums of R70-90 billion at its disposal. There was no such statement: The statement said that this was the amount of the potential of the 'shadow economy,' on the basis of which organized crime has developed."

The author claims, Boris Mikhaylov said, that until recently no success had been achieved in the fight against organized crime; and that in 1988 alone around 1,200 new "mafia" groups were formed, among whose members there were more and more "cooperative millionaires," who were earning money dishonestly. The briefing dealt, Mikhaylov noted, with the fact that "in 1988 alone over 1,200 groups with a high degree of danger and organization were brought to light."

The articles also contained other inaccuracies which misled the readers, Mikhaylov noted. This is all the more unpleasant now, he said, when glasnost has become an inalienable feature of the activity of internal affairs bodies.

Typhoon-Spawned Floods Called 'Unprecedented'

LD0108192889 Moscow TASS in English 1732 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Vladivostok August 1 TASS—Unprecedented floods pushing water levels in the rivers of the Soviet Far East more than seven meters up have left the Dalnerechensk and Lesozavodsk districts bordering on China in a critical situation, having engulfed nearly all villages and inexorably closing in on cities.

The calamity is worse even than the catastrophic floods of 1953 previously regarded as the most copious for half a century, which affected the entire north of the maritime territory.

This time, however, both sides of the Sikhote-Alin mountain range were inundated, causing irreparable damage to the regional economy.

Potato, tomato and cucumber plantations were devastated on over 100 farms and more than 70,000 head of cattle found themselves cut off from pastures or stalls.

Thousands of houses were destroyed and hundreds of kilometers of roads and telephone and power lines washed off.

People are seeking safety on rooftops and trees. Loss of life was reported in several areas.

Although the downpours that continued nonstop for five days have now stopped, the water level in rivers is declining slowly.

Disaster areas can only be reached by air and dozens of military helicopters are crisscrossing the skies over the vast lakes formed by the floods from morning till night.

They are evacuating people to safety and bringing food, medicines and clothing to water-bound villages.

Despite its scale and unpredictability, the critical situation has not wreaked panic in the region. Relief aid task forces are at work everywhere, organising efforts to save people and crops and rebuild housing and production facilities.

Economic

Economic Statistics Show 'Positive Tendencies'

LD0108195389 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Moscow August 1 TASS—The development of Russia's economy showed several positive tendencies in the first half of 1989: The transition of many factories and plants to new economic management forms, development of land leasing, the cooperative movement, the increase in retail trade, paid services, etc, the State Committee for Statistics of the Russian Federation reported today.

At the same time, the first six months of 1989 showed a somewhat slowdown in the national income growth rates because of tarry [as received] efforts to overcome negative phenomena and processes. It increased by 4,000 million roubles as against 8,000 million in the same period last year.

Industrial output went up 2.1 per cent. The output of the means of production—1.2 per cent and of consumer goods—4.9 per cent. These figures demonstrate the increased social thrust of Russia's economy.

The republic's agri-industrial sector produced 3.9 per cent more food products in the first half of the year as against the same period in 1988. Houses with 450,000 apartments were commissioned. However, the six-month plan for building apartment houses was underfulfilled.

More consumer goods were sold to the population of the republic as a whole but demand for many of them continues not to be met. At the same time, the republic produced 102,000 million roubles worth of consumer goods in half a year, which is 8,400 million roubles up on the same period of 1988.

The first half of the year has shown a considerable increase in cash incomes of workers, employees and peasants. However, wage increase outstripped the increase in worker productivity in industry two fold and in construction—1.8 times.

The report of the State Committee for Statistics of the Russian Federation says that Russia's population has reached 147.8 million people by July 1, 1989 and its workforce—87 million people, of which 80 per cent are employed in the state sector of the economy.

Over 20,000 man-hours were lost as a result of strikes in the Russian Federation in the first half of the year. The loss of working time for the same reason exceeded 1,000 thousand man-hours in miners' cities of the Kuznetsk coal basin, Western Siberia, at coal plants of the Rostov region, southern Russia, and the city of Vorkuta, northern Russia, in July.

Russia's factories and plants exported over 20,000 million roubles worth of products in the first six months of 1989. But not all contract obligations for export deliveries were fulfilled. The number of joint ventures with foreign firms registered in Russia has reached 503.

Agricultural

Early July Weather, Crop Status Reported

18240208 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 15 Jul 89 p 1

[Report by S. Malikova: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] Warm weather predominates over most of the European territory of the USSR, with individual days of hot weather. Over the most recent 10-day period, the air temperature in the Northwest region, the Baltic republics, Belorussia, the western Ukraine, the eastern Northern and Central regions, and the Volga-Vyatka region exceeded the long-standing average by 2-3 degrees, with the temperature in the Ural region exceeding it by 4-7 degrees. Rains of a torrential nature fell over the majority of the territory. The significant precipitation which fell over the Northern Caucasus, the western Central-Chernozem, and the central regions led to the expansion of the area of rain-beaten crops and complicated the conduct of harvest work. The precipitation which fell in the Volga, Volga-Vyatka, Ural, and Northern regions improved plant moisture conditions.

Winter cereal crops have ripened in the majority of locations, and their harvest continues. Milky ripeness has been observed in wheat and rye north of the Vilnius-Pskov-Kostroma-Gorkiy-Sverdlovsk line. Spring barley has ripened completely over most of the Ukraine and in the Northern Caucasus. Spring barley has reached waxy ripeness in the western Ukraine and Central-Chernozem regions, in southern Belorussia, the Central region, and in the Middle and Lower Volga regions.

Leaf formation has been completed in the country's south, and tasseling of panicles has been observed. In the zone of its production for silage, green feed also continues to show leaf formation, and tasseling of panicles has begun in early sowing period crops. Sugar beet root growth continues; conditions were favorable for this. The condition of the crops is good and excellent.

Early yellow seed ripeness has been noted in the northern oblasts of the Ukraine, 10-15 days earlier than long-standing average periods. Certain farms have begun to harvest it. Sunflowers are already blooming in the zone of their industrial processing.

The hot weather in the Transcaucasian republics was replaced by moderately warm weather during the second half of the 10-day period.

Hot (daytime 30-35 degrees), dry weather remained in Tyumen, Omsk, western Tomsk, Novosibirsk, and northern Kazakhstan oblasts. The 10-day period average temperature exceeded the long-standing average by 2-7 degrees. Agricultural crop development has been accelerated, and is 1-1.5 weeks ahead of long-standing periods. Hot, dry wind and heat with insufficient moisture depressed plants.

Cool weather was observed in agricultural areas of Eastern Siberia; it does not favor growth and development of late, heat-loving crops. Weak frosts were observed on the soil surface in certain regions, doing localized damage to potato tops and corn leaves.

Over the Far East, warm weather with minor rainfall predominated, conditions favored ripening of kernels of early summer cereal crops, potato tuber growth, and maturation of grasses.

It is hot and dry in the Central Asian republics and southern Kazakhstan. High daytime temperatures (40-45 degrees) depressed cotton plant growth.

More on Weather, Crop Status

18240212 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 25 Jul 89 p 1

[Article by S. Malikova: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] The heat subsided over the predominant part of the European territory of the USSR. The average air temperature for the previous 10-day period in the Baltic republics, Belorussia, and the western Ukraine was 2-3 degrees lower than the long-standing average. The hot weather remained only in the Volga-Vyatka region, in the north of the Volga region, and in the Ural region.

Torrential rains, locally accompanied by hail and strong wind, fell almost everywhere. Their distribution, however, was disproportionate. The greatest amount of precipitation (31-50 millimeters or more) fell over the Baltic republics, Belorussia, locally in the North-west and Northern regions, over most of the Volga-Vyatka, right-bank Volga, and eastern Central-Chernozem regions.

The harvest of grain cereal crops took place under favorable conditions in the majority of the Ukraine, Moldavia, Northern Caucasus, Central-Chernozem, Central and southern half of the Volga regions. Rains falling over the course of 1-3 days did not substantially interfere with cereal mowing or threshing processes.

It is warm in the Transcaucasian area. The greatest amount of precipitation (50-70 millimeters or more) fell over the western half of Georgia. There was no precipitation in most of Azerbaijan and Armenia. Cotton plant blossoming continued. The condition of the young crops is good.

Hot weather was noted in the agricultural regions of Western Siberia and in Krasnoyarskiy Kray. The 10-day period average air temperature exceeded the long-standing average by 3-5 degrees. The maximum air temperature was 31-35 degrees. It was cooler in the remaining territory of Eastern Siberia. Very hot weather remained in the northern oblasts of Kazakhstan. The greatest quantity of precipitation (11-30 millimeters) fell locally in Novosibirsk Oblast, in the northern Altayskiy Kray, in Kemerovo Oblast, and in the majority of Eastern Siberia, as well as locally in Northern Kazakhstan, Kokchetav, Karaganda, Taldy-Kurgan and Alma-Ata Oblasts. Ripening of winter crops has been completed in Western Siberia and the northern oblasts of Kazakhstan. Blossoming and milky ripeness have been observed in the early spring crops. Waxy ripeness has come to these crops in the Ural, a number of Aktyubinsk, Semipalatinsk, and Eastern Kazakhstan Oblasts. Their development is 10-15 days ahead of the long-standing average periods.

The temperature in the Far East is close to the long-standing average. Strong torrential rains were unfavorable for the completion of ripening of early spring cereal crops and the preparation of feed. Crop falling is possible.

It is hot over the majority of the territory of the Central Asian republics. The greatest quantity of precipitation (11-30 millimeters or more) fell over the majority of territory of the areas of Kirghizia. There was no precipitation in the remaining areas. The harvest of winter wheat was completed. Massive blossoming of cotton plants is under way, as is boll formation, with continuation of budding in areas re-sown late. Cotton plant development is 1.5-2 weeks later than the long-standing average periods.

Kuban Grain Harvest Progress Reported

18240214 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 23 Jul 89 p 1

[Unattributed report: "The Kuban Millions"]

[Text] Krasnodar, 22 July, (TASS)—The kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] of the Kuban have begun the sale of the third million metric tons of grain on state account. Hardy and valuable grades of wheat made up the major portion of this third million. Gone are the days when agronomists and farm managers blamed their failures on unstable weather. The harvest is now progressing under difficult conditions: Rain falls; in many fields, the earth is overly moist, and the grain has been beaten down. And the weather has scheduled things so that the ripening periods of the majority of grain crops—winter barley, peas, and winter wheat—have coincided. However, this time the Kuban people have not given in to the "concurrence of circumstances," having averaged almost 42 quintals of grains. The wheat harvest yield is even higher—43.5 quintals per hectare.

Scientific

Eight Nuclear Reactors Now Operating in Moscow

LD2607181289 Moscow TASS in English 1049 GMT 26 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 26 TASS—There are now eight operating nuclear reactors in Moscow, the MOSCOW NEWS weekly reports. Six of them are located at the Igor Kurchatov Nuclear Energy Institute in Voroshilov district. The largest is a 40-megawatt research reactor for the study of materials. It is designed for research in the core zones of power and transport reactors.

There is also a neutron flux standard reactor, as well as facilities for the study of shielding materials, and for medical experiments.

Another two reactors are in Sevastopolskiy and Krasnogvardeyskiy districts. A 2.5-megawatt reactor is intended for research and belongs to the Moscow Engineering Physics Institute.

The radiological situation in Moscow is monitored by several organisations—the State Committee for Hydrometeorology, the Institute of Biophysics, and the Central Sanitary Epidemiological Station.

The radiological situation in the institutes themselves, where the reactors are installed, is constantly monitored, said Valentin Sarychev, departmental chief at the USSR health ministry's third main department which coordinates radiological monitoring in Moscow.

"We also monitor the concentration of absolutely all harmful substances discharged into the air, soil and water. Concentration amounts are sometimes much less than the permissible sanitary norm.

"Morevoer, we are now revising sanitary regulations to make them conform to international standards. In 1986 we carried out a survey and prepared a document which envisages the eventual removal of all reactors from Moscow.

"The presence of radioactive facilities in or near a population of many millions is inadvisable," Sarychev said.

"On our insistence, the reactor which was installed at the Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics way back in 1947 has already been shut down. By the way, without our permission no institution may install a new reactor."

Work of Research Ship Keldysh Reported

18650186 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 20 Jul 89 p 4

[Article by Ya. Leder and I. Nekrasov: "Meeting in the Abyss"]

[Text] **The research ship Akademik Mstislav Keldysh is conducting geological research in the central part of the Atlantic Ocean. Samples of primary rock were brought up from the bottom, which helps to understand the nature of this area, an unusual one in a geological sense... A meeting of two crews occurred at a depth of 5,000 meters for the first time in the history of the use of underwater manned-capsules.**
(From a radiogram of Professor V. Yastrebov, expedition chief.)

...The pale blue submarines under a 5-kilometer thickness of water seem completely colorless. Only the bright flashlights can be made out in the impenetrable black background. Two underwater research capsules, Mir-1 and Mir-2, rendezvous, like space ships in orbit. The dive lasted 16 hours, and about 3 hours were spent in mutual searches and approaches—docking in ocean depths proved to be an operation no less complicated than in near-earth space. And then came the long-awaited meeting of Soviet and American scientists, jointly piloting the underwater stations.

Not many people know that the ship Akademik Mstislav Keldysh has been entered in the Guinness Book of Records as a ship that has the world's most expensive scientific equipment on board.

This time the ship was completing a trip that was not entirely usual. It was decided to bring a group of scientists to Washington and an exposition for participation in the 28th session of the International Geological Congress which was taking place there, and on the way to investigate the unique area of the depression of Kings-Trough, which joins the Middle Atlantic ridge.

About 50 samples of primary rock were brought up, and photographs and movie films were made.

After several days, Professor V. Yastrebov, the director of the Institute of Oceanology of the USSR Academy of Sciences and leader of the expedition, shared the results of the research in Washington. Incidentally, his speech was not included in the agenda of the congress, but after the radiogram from on board the Mstislav Keldysh, the Soviet specialist was given the floor on the very first day of the session: The interest was that great in the underwater experiment.

"The Kings-Trough depression is situated 'under the side of' the Middle Ridge, very mysterious," says V. Yastrebov. "Up until now it has not been known why it appeared. Now, perhaps, we have cleared up the 'scenario': The depression was formed in two stages. Later structures were found that were superimposed on the ancient foundation. A mosaic structure of the bottom was found in the region of Kings-Trough. Similar 'blocks' were found earlier in other areas also. The conclusion can be made that such structures are typical of the Atlantic."

Looking for natural developments and engaging in basic research, we are at the same time preparing a base for future practical work on bottom rock.

However, it is still early to develop the underwater storeroom, the professor believes. Today's equipment can only do a lot of harm to the ocean.

There are other problems also. Specialists from various countries are thinking about how to resolve them. Collaboration with oceanologists of the United States is moving from individual joint experiments to the plane of long-range collaboration. This year, the Institute of Oceanology signed a 5-year agreement with the geological observatory in Lomond, which is not far from New York. There is forthcoming work within the framework of the international project "Thetis." This program was named after the ancient ocean which hundreds of millions of years ago separated Africa from Eurasia. The program should give an answer, nonetheless, to how today's oceans and continents were formed.

As the scientists think, the collision of the "black continent" with the Eurasian continent caused a giant mountain mass stretching from the Pyrenean Peninsula to the Pacific Ocean coast of the USSR and China. And the echoes of this grand cataclysm can still be felt up to the present time: It is possible that it is to them that we are "indebted" for the tragedy in Armenia in December of last year.

Device Created for Detecting AIDS, Cancer

LD3007122489 Moscow TASS in English 1141 GMT 30 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 30 TASS—A device created in the Soviet Union diagnoses cancer, aids, tuberculosis and other dangerous diseases of man in 15 minutes. It can detect the disease at such an early stage at which it does not manifest itself in any way, IZVESTIYA wrote today. According to the authors of the device, Arik-01 resembles a conductometer for measuring the resistance of liquids which is widely used in physics and chemistry.

The use of the device helps save a lot of time. The immunity-enzyme analysis used now takes several hours, instead of 15 minutes in case of Arik-01. Besides, the device can diagnose the disease at once by such a small amount of particles in the solution that no other chemical reaction can interfere in the diagnosing process. The third important advantage of the new method is a very small volume of the serum used for the test. The amount of test reagents needed for one reaction in accordance with the traditional method would be enough for 1,000 analyses in accordance with the new one. A blood sample is not necessary for diagnosing this or that disease. Any liquid biological material of the human organism can be used, specifically, saliva, urine, and tears. They all contain antigens and antibodies in case of a disease.

The new express-method can be used for diagnosing myocardial infarction and insultus. There are no such devices in other countries.

The newspaper pointed out that the device could be effectively used in agriculture. For example, the new method was used for a checkup of sick animals at one of the state farms of the Saratov region. Results of a subsequent examination fully confirmed the results obtained with the help of the new method. Specialists from the biotechnologia research and production amalgamation intend to determine with its help the quality of seeds, including planting potatoes.

Military

Defense Minister Yazov Speaks on Social Issues

PM0108150189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jul 89 First Edition p 2

[Discussion involving Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister; USSR People's Deputy Yuliya Sokolova, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and senior instructor at the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA special correspondent Yelena Agapova: "The Time Raises the Questions. How Are They To Be Resolved? The USSR Defense Minister, a Member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and a KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Special Correspondent Discuss Social Problems in the Armed Forces"; date and place not specified; first three paragraphs are Sokolova and Agapova introduction]

[Text] The subject of social protection or, more accurately, the lack of it for officers and their families—people in one of the most difficult professions—has assumed particular social significance today. Deputies at the Supreme Soviet session turned to this subject on several occasions when discussing the candidate for the post of USSR defense minister. There have been innumerable appeals from military personnel to deputies and letters to KRASNAYA ZVEZDA and, presumably, to the defense minister on this subject.

Back at the time when candidate deputies were struggling to secure confidence in their program, we sensed particularly keenly the need for this meeting. "We" means Yuliya Sokolova, USSR people's deputy, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, senior instructor at the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, and her agent, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Yelena Agapova. Strictly speaking, our numerous meetings with servicemen and their families also motivated our turning to Army General Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister.

By coincidence our meeting took place on the last day of the government's formation. That day, we were told, the minister began work a little earlier than usual—at 0620. He normally sets about his official business at 0640.

Sokolova: Dmitriy Timofeyevich, the government has finally been formed. We will not forget the tense days when candidate ministers were submitted to the Supreme Soviet. Every candidate was asked many questions, but I thought that the candidate defense minister was asked the most. I saw a vast file of questions for you....

Yazov: There is a new file of questions every day. I begin my working day with them. On the one hand, they are, of course, unresolved questions. On the other, deputies also raise problems that they should resolve themselves. That's why they're people's deputies. There are also issues on which deputies can make requests but not demands. These evidently include problems concerning our growth and development. I believe that together we are all learning democracy and growing to some extent. Both parliamentarians and ministers....

Sokolova: It is no coincidence that questions of deputies' ethics and self-education were raised. We deputies must indeed work and study soundly. For parliamentary experience is only just being acquired.

Agapova: But, you will concur that deputies are quite correct in raising a number of questions. Some have been resolved, including such an acute question as the discharge of students from the Army.

Yazov: You know, I have received hundreds if not thousands of reports from students asking to be given an opportunity to complete their army service. We do have these reports. You can also ask the commander of the Airborne Assault Forces for examples. But I cannot meet them halfway. That would mean violating a Supreme Soviet resolution.

Sokolova: This is a long-awaited decision for the soldiers' mothers. But, you will agree that we rarely address the subject of parental responsibility at present. We address all our recriminations to commanders and political workers and completely forget about the family's responsibility.

Yazov: I grew up in the countryside and I remember my late grandmother once saying: A child must be raised until he is fully grown. A soldier manifests what was enshrined in the family—conscientiousness, kindness, physical development, sociability—within the Army. Here you have a guy with a clean slate and a good record but such a "mommy's boy" that he is incapable of doing anything. But everyone is equal among soldiers! No one clears up after a soldier and washes his socks He does everything himself. There are those who endeavor to find an easier, cosier spot at others' expense. But by and large it is capable and physically fit young men, prepared in every respect, who are entering the Army.

Agapova: Order and discipline in the Army have recently been associated with "turning the screws." This opinion has begun to become current.

Yazov: That is what one deputy said. But I have a question: What screws and who is turning them? Regulations must be fulfilled. They ultimately represent the experience that has been accumulated over the ages. The regulations have existed as long as the regular Russian Army. Since the time of Peter the Great. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA recently published new draft regulations. We intend to discuss them on a most democratic basis. Please, make a proposal, we will discuss it openly and no one intends to turn any screws.

Sokolova: You began to talk about discipline and regulations. I would like to return to the question that I asked when your candidacy was being discussed and which may have been lost in the flood of other questions—what, in your opinion, is the essence of democratization in the Army?

Yazov: Isn't the very fact that a newspaper has published the draft regulations a democratic step? I think that it is. Everyone can express their opinion, regardless of rank and classification. This shows that we are seeking forms of democratization. But we must not issue commands collectively—whether to attack or not and whether to take a defensive or offensive stance. A commander must make decisions and it is the task of the others to fulfill his decisions. You remember, in Aleksandr Bek's "Volokolamsk Highway" [Volokamskoye Shosse] battalion commander Momysh-Uly said the following: "Yesterday you were people from different professions... yesterday you were ordinary collective farm workers and directors. As of today you are soldiers... and I am your commander. I give the orders—you obey.... Yesterday you could argue with your boss. Today the homeland denies you that right. As of today you have one law—your commander's orders." That was harsh necessity. But today when the process of democratization is under way in society, one should not put the following idea first: I am the commander and you are my subordinates. Today a commander has to take public opinion into consideration, rely on it, and make full use of the opportunities availed by democratic institutions within the Army and Navy.

Is it really so bad for the regiment to have an ideological council comprising the most mature Communists, who will elaborate the ideology behind this education; or a methodological council, a certification commission? You have both one-man command and social levers in operation. What about a women's council for instance. Women are not subordinate to the commander but rather are a component part of the collective. When I was in command of a division, I had very close contacts with the women's council. They always visited soldiers in the hospital. They always brought presents—candy, fruit, and cookies. Who are these soldiers? Yesterday's schoolchildren. Someone's children. I remember a summer or winter training period coming to an end and the women's council invited all the officers to a ball. It would be announced that, relatively speaking, Captain Petrov's subunit held first place in such-and-such a discipline. Some people's artist would sing a song in his honor. There would be a roar of applause while the officer would have tears in his eyes. The commander noted the success and the community backed him. That uplifts the members of a regimental family.

Sokolova: The women's councils are now continuing the traditions from the years when you were a young officer.

Yazov: I am grateful to the women who write letters and maintain links with the parents of soldiers and the families of officers who are serving elsewhere.

Agapova: A word about the question of democratization. Dmitriy Timofeyevich, how did you regard the military deputies' speeches which criticized both the Defense Ministry and you? What did you feel then and can one regard these speeches as a manifestation of democratization in the Army?

Yazov: You see, there are various kinds of democratization. I have been serving in the Army for 49 years. The people who made these speeches have been serving 1-9 years and a second group somewhat longer. Their experience only enabled them to cover the area of knowledge and the life of those collectives in which they have served. One may have served in a junior aviation specialist school, another at a training center. They were possibly correct in everything they said within the context of their unit. But attempts to extrapolate the shortcomings there to the Defense Ministry as a whole are evidently not correct. I by no means bear a grudge against them. But I do not consider their generalizations to be quite logical. I did not presume to make such generalizations when I had only been in command of the Armed Forces for 1 year. It is only now that I have entered my 3d year in this post that I can say what is being resolved badly and well in our country.

Sokolova: Dmitriy Timofeyevich, I venture to remind you of another part of my question at the session—regarding social protection for servicemen's families. The situation is now growing complex in connection with reduction in the Armed Forces. How did you think the Supreme Soviet helped? We would very much like to ensure that the Supreme Soviet perceives and realizes that the Army also must be helped rather than just called to account....

Yazov: You are correct in mentioning social protection. But the truth is one thing and opportunities are another. Talking about rights, all servicemen under the Constitution have the right not only to housing, but also to work and education.... But imagine a captain arrives on some remote island. Where will his wife work if he is the chief of a border post or the commander of a radar company? There is nowhere for her to work. Have her rights or the family's rights been violated? I think not. We provide rations and monetary allowances in that case. Not single rate, but 1 and ½ times or double. That is to some extent a solution to the problem of material life.

Agapova: Still the question of the duration of labor service is still open....

Yazov: That is indeed a problem. An officer's wife travels about, but when she approaches old age she has not worked long enough to be allocated a pension. The Supreme Soviet must adopt a decision here. I consider it reasonable to reckon an officer's wife has worked the length of time her officer husband has spent in places where she cannot be given work and where concessions are fixed in this respect. Many people ask the following question: What about groups of forces? There is work, but where? She can work in the boiler room, clearing ashes, or performing some menial task in the kitchens... But officers' wives often have a higher education. Once again we give an officer double pay so that his family does not feel materially deprived. Although there is still the question of length of service.

Sokolova: There is a department that has solved this question. For instance, the time that diplomats' wives spend abroad is included in their length of service.

Yazov: The Supreme Soviet may resolve this question in the near future.

Sokolova: Can this petition be taken, for instance to the Committee for the Affairs of Women...

Yazov: We have already done so....

Agapova: Letters from readers and letters to deputies ask questions linked with the reduction in the Armed Forces.

Yazov: We are to reduce 500,000 servicemen, including almost 100,000 officers. We will simply not draft 400,000 of the 500,000. It has been decided not to draft students. Whom are we discharging? People who have completed their prescribed period of military service and who have the right to a full pension from the Defense Ministry. They are or will be generally provided with apartments. If anyone has not completed the prescribed period of military service for a pension and their unit is being disbanded, this officer will be given the opportunity to complete the period of service remaining until the pension through 1991. That is we still have 2 and ½ years in which to solve these problems. A word about young officers. There are certainly some who wish to be discharged. Cadre organs will investigate every specific case of young officers. As for disbanding divisions, we have determined which divisions will be disbanded. Those people who have completed their prescribed period of service will be discharged. The rest will be distributed around the Armed Forces.

Agapova: The following question arises: Where will people who are directly affected by the units' disbandments live?

Yazov:: They will live where they are assigned for their new post. We will resolve the issue with every officer individually.

Agapova: Nonetheless people are generally moving to an unsettled life. In the Western Group of Forces, for instance, an officer's wife may take the children and go to her parents if they are in the Soviet Union. But there are no social guarantees when living with parents. No residence permit, no work, and no medical service. She waits for her husband to receive a roof over his head.

Yazov: We consulted the commanders of the groups of forces. An officer travels to the disbandment point. That takes approximately 1 month to 6 weeks. He receives a posting there. But where will his wife live at the disbandment point? There's nowhere. He obtains a posting, goes to get his wife, and moves on to his new duty position.

Agapova: Are there guarantees that he will obtain housing in the new place?

Yazov: I cannot give any guarantee that an apartment will be waiting in every cantonment. At any rate an officer will be provided with a roof over his head. We have constructed and are constructing all cantonments on the basis of the authorized strength of the officer personnel. But it is another matter when people are forced to stay in these cantonments permanently.

Agapova: It is well known that R4.6 billion have been allocated for military construction this year. Is there an individual section regarding construction of housing for servicemen? Has this figure been announced anywhere at all?

Yazov: Such a section does exist. This figure has not been announced. There is nothing secret here. We simply have to agree to this step ourselves—we have to agree to channel one-half of these funds into housing construction. Unfortunately, there are construction projects that simply cannot be abandoned. But we have abandoned everything we can which is not extremely necessary today and turned to housing. But it is not only a matter of money. Housing construction materials are in short supply. Everyone is engaged in construction and everyone needs cement, metal, and structures. We at the Defense Ministry have several housing construction combines. We can make approximately 100 apartment blocks [doma] a year. But we obtain a considerable amount of housing from the local soviets.

Agapova: How many servicemen are there today without apartments?

Yazov: Figures do exist but they must be amplified.

Agapova: Is the figure of 7,500 officers without apartments in Moscow a realistic one?

Yazov: It is. I have now appointed a special commission which will carry out an inspection at all cantonments. We have cantonments with empty apartments. But people have been waiting years for housing in Moscow, Leningrad, Odessa, Kiev, Minsk, Sevastopol, and Simferopol for instance.

Agapov: KRASNAYA ZVEZDA is now receiving many letters in which officers write sadly that their personal life conflicts with their professional tasks. A pilot, a submariner, and a missileman hold tremendous power but when a pilot comes down to earth or a submariner docks their highly intellectual professional life clashes with their wretched social and domestic life.

Yazov: Of course, these people especially need good recreational conditions. Distortions have been permitted here. Yet we have constructed apartments for every pilot. They should have been made standard-issue regulation apartments to go with the job ensuring that not just anyone would be entitled to occupy the apartment of a pilot from such-and-such an aircraft. These apartments were not always occupied by pilots. We recently held a military council meeting in the Air Force. We set the task of providing all pilots with apartments this year.

Agapova: Dmitriy Timofeyevich, do you think that some percentage of the funds being released in connection with the cuts can be used for these needs?

Yazov: Of course. This will depend on the overall economic situation in the state.

Sokolova: Many people are now talking and writing about the prestige of the military profession, saying that it has been shaken. But I believe that on the day we described as military day at the Congress when the Congress defended the honor of the "Afghan" veterans, we all received an example of how the people regard their Army.

Yazov: I saw Chervonopiskiy today. He has been awarded the title of colonel in the reserve. Could you possibly congratulate him via the newspaper. I will say the following: There always were, are, and will be defenders of the homeland.

Sokolova: You deal with people and incredibly complex equipment. Do both the people and equipment let you down...?

Yazov: Everything happens. We have still not determined what happened with the submarine reactor where the hermetic seal of the first loop was damaged. The temperature is still high. But we will be able to investigate in the near future. I generally look at events from philosophical standpoints. Philosophy does not rule out chance happenings. But chance happenings are also law-governed. If we only count on chance happenings and do not foresee and combat them, they will occur more frequently. We are trying to do everything possible to ensure that there are fewer chance happenings—both with equipment and with people. The higher the professional skill, the fewer accidents and mishaps there are.

Sokolova: Dmitriy Timofeyevich, we wish you success in this and hope that the Army has as few problems as possible so that people in it feel protected. Thank you for the conversation.

Airborne Troop Commander on Military Doctrine

LD0208101689 Moscow TASS in English 0605 GMT 2 Aug 89

[TASS transmits a service message at 0953 GMT which kills the following item]

[Text] Moscow August 2 TASS—The new defensive Soviet military doctrine demands that airborne troops should, if need be, fulfil missions of a defensive character, Lieutenant General Vladislav Achalov, airborne troop commander, said in a PRAVDA interview published today. As long as there are no guarantees of the irreversibility of the present positive processes in the world, Soviet people demand that we consolidate the country's defences. Proceeding from this assumption, we are upgrading airborne troops, General Achalov said.

The world situation is changing for the better, and it is obvious that new thinking in world politics is bringing positive results. However, by all appearances, it will be a long time before we can run bayonets into the ground. Our partners by disarmament talks continue to modernise their weapons and create entirely new types of strategic defensive armaments, both missile, air-based and sea-based ones. Representatives of U.S. ruling circles again make statements about the possibility of winning a nuclear war. Along with actively pursuing a peaceful foreign policy which, of course, meets the vital interests and aspirations of all the people of the world, we, servicemen, should think about the country's defences and the combat preparedness of those who protect it. This is our principal mission, General Achalov said.

Ligachev, Baklanov Discuss Defense Conversion

OW2807020289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0700 GMT 22 Jul 89

[Interview with Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Oleg Dmitriyevich Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and Igor Sergeyevich Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at the VDNKh [Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy] in Moscow; from the "Talking to the Point" program presented by political observer V.P. Beketov and devoted to conversion of the defense industry; date not given]

[Excerpts] [Ligachev] I am deeply convinced that the enormous burden of military expenditure we carry by way of historically formed circumstances and a number of other factors, is quite simply incompatible with the restructuring of our economy to a new qualitative level. I would even say more. If we could do everything as we would like to, yet not be able to decrease military expenditure, in that case too we would experience incredible difficulties in making changes, particularly in the sphere of the economy and, naturally, in the social sphere as well.

Currently, as a result of the very intensive and quite effective foreign policy of our country, we have managed to turn from confrontation to dialogue and cooperation in the international arena. This gives us an opportunity to considerably lower expenditure for our country's defense, without generally decreasing its defense capability and maintaining it, as we say now, at a sufficiently reliable level. This is of fundamental significance. And it seems to me that, in connection with this, new opportunities have presented themselves to us to solve major social problems. In particular, there is the food problem. [passage omitted, introducing members of studio panel participating in the program, representing the military-industrial and VASKhNIL scientific complexes]

We are losing an enormous quantity of products. Now, I could cite a few examples, for instance, there is insufficient meat in the country. We are losing—according to estimates of our specialists—because of weaknesses in the meat processing industry, no less than 1 million tonnes. There is an enormous need, yet we lose 1 million a year.

[Beketov] Possibly this is just the amount we need to solve the problem?

[Ligachev] To a certain extent, yes. Anyway, they say that we could get an increase of 30 percent—I would not mention this figure, but it is at least 20 percent—through perfection of processing, through an expansion of the processing network, through getting closer to the sources of production, and through an improvement in the technological level. Now, can you imagine, if we were to add another 15 to 20 percent in agriculture—and this is already a reality in the coming 7 to 8 years—we could considerably supplement the food sales? [video cuts abruptly to show Oleg Dmitriyevich Baklanov]

[Baklanov] What is the main question? The following situation is characteristic for both leading companies abroad and our leading associations. Who can rapidly change output? The one who has the greatest mobility. Now, it is this peculiarity of our complex, which is headed by Igor Sergeyevich [Belousov], which provides the opportunity—along with retaining defense matters at their level—for rapidly changing the output of agricultural products. I say rapidly, on the one hand, while on the other, we have heard criticism here today that things are slow and quantities insufficient. And this is very correct.

We have agreed that we shall create a kind of permanently operating fair, not at the level of ministry leaders, but at the level of kolkhoz [collective farm] and sovkhoz [state farm] chairmen and individual agricultural producers. They will be able to visit, hold talks with producers, the representatives of manufacturers of these goods, make their suggestions, and conclude direct agreements giving them a kind of vital mutual link between the producer and the consumer. [video cuts abruptly to Belousov who is shown standing to Baklanov's right]

[Belousov] Currently, agricultural working people, and I believe all Soviet people, are linking the positive changes which must occur in agriculture with the work of the defense complex. And I consider these hopes to be well-founded, because the new political thinking which brought about the opportunity to change to a defense doctrine permitted, and will permit in the future, release of considerable capacities of the defense industry for the national economy and for work for agriculture. This is the factual side of the matter, and this kind of release will be sufficiently large. It will amount to many billions of rubles. [passage omitted, during which studio panel and video reports discuss agricultural equipment problems]

At the Supreme Soviet Session, I was asked the question: How will the plants changing to peace-time production look? Will they be able to keep their qualification? I must say that comrades today could become thoroughly convinced of the fact that those products turned out for the agroindustrial complex, for processing, are by their technical content—if of course we do not talk about goods produced in previous years, but about products the production of which has begun now, and will be produced in the future—these goods are of the highest technical level and highest technical complexity. In other words, the skills of people who worked in the production of military equipment will not decrease. I consider that these levels will, in many ways, be comparable. [video shows Baklanov and Ligachev standing to Belousov's left]

[Beketov] Today, we looked at the Kutaisi tractors and were told that this was not our main product. What does "not our main product" mean when there is an extremely great demand for it? How can this psychological barrier be broken? How can we change the opinion that production of goods for the national economy is somehow a second rate matter compared with our military affairs?

[Belousov] Over a very long period of time, obviously insufficient attention was paid to all these questions—the processing of agroindustrial products, the individual farm plots—and the results I spoke about testify to this. More needs to be done in 8 years than we have done in 40 years. Currently, we must follow three directions. First is the supply of equipment for industrial enterprises. This is necessary and important. Second, the supply of modular versions of various kinds of equipment for sovkhozes and kolkhozes. We saw some today, like those for milk processing and cheese production. Vegetable processing was shown here recently. And finally, the third direction aims at individual farms. Beginning this year—previously we were not engaged in this, I must say frankly we practically did not work on this— we shall involve and have already involved many enterprises in this. [Video cuts to show Ligachev]

[Ligachev] Now, when the defense complex has joined in—and you can feel that its leader has a brilliant grasp of agricultural terminology—this makes me very happy. [laughs]

[Beketov] Yes, it is very good.

[Ligachev] It makes me very happy. You cannot tell them apart, I think—I have now had an infusion of faith, that the business with science and technology in our countryside will proceed much more rapidly. This means that everything will go better than ever before, although some think that, in a year or two, everything will already be all right. No! A long time is required. In 2 to 3 years, we can ease or, at the very best, remove the seriousness of the food problem, but not more. As far as the stable supply of food is concerned, many years will be required for this, and everyone must get used to the idea of a long period. [passage omitted, in which panel participants suggest which equipment the defense industry must produce first].

Deputies' Armed Forces Debate Viewed

PM2807113089 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 30, 23 Jul 89 p 13

[MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN deputy chief editor Aleksey Pakin article: "Army for the People, Or for Generals. Soviet Armed Forces: MPs' Views"—first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] On July 11, 1989, the USSR Supreme Soviet passed a Decision to discharge from military service higher school students drafted in 1986-1988 to serve as borderguards, and internal and railway troops. This Decision is the first concrete result of discussions by the Soviet parliament of the country's defence matters.

Aleksey Pankin, Cand. Sc. (History), Deputy Editor-in-Chief of the magazine "International Affairs" looks at the progress of these debates and at what thoughts they provoke.

The June issue of the IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS (GAZETTE OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE) carried A Memo of the State and Law and Ideology departments of the CPSU Central Committee, and of the Main Political Department of the Soviet Army and Navy "On How the Nationally Circulated Press Covers the Soviet Armed Forces' Life and the Activity". The Memo boils down to this: the press "publishes superficial, biased, incompletent publications which undermine the prestige of the Armed Forces, the prestige of army service, and the rapport between the army and the people". It pushes the idea about the army as "a closed zone"; "some articles portray the army as a source of all that is dogmatic and anti-democratic"; the matters of discipline are commented on "in an accusingly satirical tone", etc. the conclusion is there should be some measures taken to ensure a more competent reporting on the Armed Forces' problems.

The memo was reprinted by the army newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on July 6, 1989. This double publication provided a background for the Supreme Soviet debates on the appointment of General of the Army Dmitriy Yazov as the country's Minister of Defence. What I saw and heard at the session gave a new meaning to me of the threadbare slogan "Defence is a national cause". One can agree perhaps with the Memo's idea that 'the real truth about army service and the way things are run in it is known in fact to every Soviet family".

Most of the questions and addresses of MPs touched on the two topics: discipline (breaches of regulations) and the shameful material position of the country's defenders. ("There are two toilets, one bath, two showers, and three stoves in a hostel for 12 married officers—a total of 60 adults and children," said MP [Member of Parliament] S.Kalashnikov.) These problems, I think, are the effect rather than the cause of the difficulties faced by our army. Still they affect human lives and are taken to heart by voters, and it is easy to see why MPs concentrate precisely on these difficulties.

It's a shame though, that MPs had no time to do their homework properly before starting the debate. Many speakers sounded rather like petitioners than competent lawmakers possessing all the necessary information.

I'm not sure about MPs' reactions to the following explanations from Gen. Yazov: "We have instituted meetings of officers, and soldiers' meetings are held more frequently. Soldiers have been permitted to take their grievances to any commander where in the past they were obliged to secure the permission of their squad commander and of other commanders down the line. This is evidence of democratization."

They have a different view of democratization in, say, West Germany. When the Bundeswehr was set up, breach of discipline was a major problem, a hangover from the Wehr-macht and of Prussian military practices. Then in 1959 there was formed an office of the Bundestage commissioner for the Armed Forces. The agency gives servicemen a sort of legal protection: in the 30 years of its existence it has looked into nearly 200,000 written requests and grievances on such matters as wanting to do military service near one's home, poor medical attention, the conferring of ranks and promotions, and incidents of rudeness, fault-finding and humiliation from one's superiors.

To set up such an agency, I think, is within the power of the Supreme Soviet. And no permission should be sought even from the Minister of Defence.

Holland took a different path. There they have unions for servicemen.

All this information is not a closely guarded secret. But let's not be too strict towards our legislators—we can't expect every one of them have a thorough knowledge of every subject. I can add only that competence would help not only those who criticize the army in its present shape, but also those who speak in its defence.

In the above-mentioned Memo I've found several factual mistakes and a number of distortions of facts. For example, several emotional remarks by Lyudmila Saraskina are quoted, as if from an article, though they were made during the round-table discussion "The Army and society" (XX Century and Peace, No. 9, 1988) which involved another twenty participants, including one major-general, one colonel, four lieutenant-colonels and one major. Andrey Nuykin's remarks during this discussion is said to be made in March, a whole six months before the event. Lyudmila Saraskina, who works for the harmless Institute of Teaching Art Appreciation of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, is referred to simply as a senior researcher of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, an organization whose image is firmly tainted in the public eye. Where's military precision?

"In a number of publications," the Memo says, "there appear incompetent reports on defence policy, where scientifically bankrupt proposals are made which take no account of the military and political realities. MOSCOW NEWS (November 6, 1988) in its article 'What Kind of Armed Forces We Need' in fact advocates the renunciation of 'a continued developing of our peacetime army as a regular and mass-scale army'." I'm sorry, but it's not the weekly that made "scientifically bankrupt proposals", but the man who wrote the article—Colonel of the paratroops A. Savinkin, Cand. Sc. (Philosophy). Don't many MPs share his views?

It made me feel uncomfortable to think that this imprecise and biased information should serve as the basis for serious decisions.

But whatever our view of the competence of those involved in the discussion of the Armed Forces, the discussion is under way. And it looks like the Supreme Soviet is going to see to it that it grows in scope. This hope is nourished in me by the fact that there have emerged from among the MPs a number of serious experts who have broached really fundamental issues.

As a deputy, V. Kiseleva, a working woman, referred in her address at the Congress of People's Deputies to the words of head of the Chief Political Department A. Lizichev that the number of offices filled by generals had been cut in this country by 1,400. She said the US had a total of 1,073 generals. Let me add that the 500,000-strong Bundeswehr has a bit more than 200 generals and admirals. Thus the Soviet Armed Forces have discharged more generals than there are in the two biggest NATO armies, whose strength is being constantly referred to, not without bias, by our military.

In the US army, there are 3,400 servicemen per general, in West German army the figure is 2,400. Multiplying 1,073 US generals by 5 (the multiple of excess generals we have, according to MP V. Podziruk, who is a colonel) and dividing 3,700,000 (the number of servicemen in our army) by the product, we get the following ratio: one general for roughly 700 servicemen.

We can quote more statistics. The Chief of the Main Political Department said that in addition to cutting down on generals, the number of colonels had been also cut by 11,000. For comparison: the US armed forces today has around 13,500 colonels and naval captains. So how many colonels do we have? If we have a general for each battalion, then do colonels command platoons? Why this big share of generals and officers in the Soviet Armed Forces among servicemen who are drafted? Why is their number less in the professional US Army? Don't we already have an army of professionals?

Or some other sort of an army? Let's try and see.

MP Podziruk said: "Here in this country we have for some reason five armed services, not three as elsewhere in the world. In addition to the usual three we have the Air Defence Forces of the Country, and the Strategic Missile Troops. Elsewhere in the world there exist the three armed services: land troops, air force and navy. All these are separate in this country. This could have been one of the reasons for Mathias Rust landing on Red Square.

Dmitriy Yazov said: "We have 83 military state farms and more than a hundred dairy farms..." He also made mention of construction units, road-building units, railway troops, help with harvesting, etc., and complained that "so far we unfortunately can't have an officer for each construction platoon". He reassured us by announcing the setting up of zonal political departments to deal with disciplinary matters. From the publication in IZVESTIYA (July 4, 1989) we have learned about military units attached to the Ministry of Land improvement and Water Conservation. As regards production, these units are in the charge of civilian managers and territorially of military districts. MP Podziruk said: "We have, for example, many athletic battalions which are part of the army."

What do the additional armed services have in common with athletic battalions? Nothing, if you consider the army as a means to ensure our security. But everything becomes crystal clear if you regard the army as a bureaucratic institution.

Indeed, an additional armed service is another marshal's star and a position of a Defence Minister's deputy. It also means a colonel-general position as head of a political department, Armed Forces staff, generals, colonels, etc. What about farming, construction, etc.? From ancient times it has been known that forced labour is ruinous for a national economy, and the era of scientific and technical revolution has hardly improved things in this regard. What is not known is how many generals, colonels and political officers lead a whole army of lads unfit for service as combat troops plus one hundred thousand former convicts (according to Dmitriy Yazov) on the labour front.

Winding up the discussion of the prospect for the Minister of Defence, Mikhail Gorbachev revealed that 101 sham divisions that only existed as sinecures had been eliminated in recent years. How many such sinecure divisions, military districts, and even armed services still remain? Is such a waste possible in a self-respecting professional army? Or in a public-controlled militia-cadre army, the very idea of which is an anathema with our military leaders? Should we rack our brains over where to get funds to improve living conditions for those who really serve in the army?

And yet one more question: if we deduct all those who fatten pigs, milk the cows, and improve land, etc., how many people are there on combat duty? In the United States, according to data our Defence Ministry has, there are 3,650,000 servicemen who are in all evidence full-fledged combatants.

MP Kiseleva is right: "Pardon me, please, but what do we need the army for then? My idea of the army is it should be an army. If you turn to Russian history, who was in our army? In our army there was the flower of our nation. What has our army been reduced to?"

Can one be surprised that in press reports about the army, to quote from the Memo, "There is often no place for heroic and romantic spirit, or thoughts on the lofty vocation of military service and respect for the army?"

Military Prosecutor's Office Discusses Tasks

PM2807134389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Jul 89 First Edition p 4

[Report by Colonel L. Nechayuk under the rubric "At the Main Military Prosecutor's Office": "Action Program Outlined"]

[Text] The state of legality and law and order in the Armed Forces and tasks to further strengthen them arising out of the decisions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and demands of the USSR Prosecutor's Office have been examined at a Chief Military Prosecutor's Office collegium.

The session, chaired by Justice Major General A.F. Katusev, chief military prosecutor and USSR deputy general prosecutor, was attended by the military prosecutors of categories of the Armed Forces, military districts, fleets and groups of forces, and individual garrisons.

The speakers focused attention on the priority areas of prosecutor's oversight of the implementation of laws in the defense, economic, and social spheres. It was noted that questions of the fight against crime have become more acute in today's new social and political situation. Law enforcement organs, including the military prosecutor's office, have been fairly criticized for not being effective enough in their work on the prevention, detection, and investigation of crimes. This applies directly to the state of military discipline and law and order in the forces.

The transfer of all defense building to predominantly qualitative parameters demands much fuller exploitation of people's creative potential as individuals, so it is necessary to sharpen the focus of prosecutor's office oversight on the protection of the dignity and legitimate rights and interests of servicemen, workers and employees of the Army and Navy, and members of their families against all manifestations of arbitrariness and administrative and bureaucratic abominations.

Military prosecutors must also keep an eye on ecology issues, it was pointed out at the session. Supervision of the implementation of nature conservation legislation consists not only in reducing the damage to nature and to the local population caused by the activities of troops and naval forces, but also being concerned about military people and about providing a normal environment for them to live and serve in.

The session participants stressed that the increasing number of accidents incolving ships and aircraft and other incidents make it incumbent on military prosecutors to step up supervision of the implementation of laws on supplies of high-quality armaments and military equipment. By stopping supplies of defective items the prosecutor makes a direct contribution to strengthening combat readiness and, at the same time, protects servicemen's lives against unwarranted risk.

It was proposed that all work on preventing breaches of legality and strengthening law and order in the Armed Forces should be carried out in conditions of widespread glasnost and close collaboration between military prosecutor's offices and commanders, political organizers, staffs, military tribunals, and party organizations, and the army and navy community.

Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister; Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; and senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Defense Ministry, and law enforcement organs participated in the collegium's work.

Missile Cruiser Inspected by U.S. Officials

LD3007132189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 30 Jul 89

[Excerpts] Today is USSR Navy Day. Our Crimean correspondent Vladimir Plotnikov, reports from Sevastopol.

[Plotnikov] [passage omitted on naval displays] The most unusual mission on the eve of this holiday belonged to the missile cruiser "Slava", which was involved in a Soviet-U.S. experiment on the verification of sea-based nuclear weapons. The crew afforded experts an opportunity to check various ways of detecting missiles with nuclear warheads on their ship. This open and confiding manner made a great impression on the visitors, which included members of the U.S. Congress. They viewed it as support by our Navy for the Soviet initiatives to reduce nuclear weapons. At the same time, is our defense capacity suffering? I will turn to one of the officers of the formation of ships, (Aleksandr Georgiyevich Levchenko):

[Levchenko] The steps being taken are correct and proper, and it is, thus, no coincidence that we are now waging a campaign for high qualitative parameters in combat training. How can that be expressed in specific terms? The old ships, obsolete both in terms of technical specifications and armaments, are being taken out of service, and ships like the "Slava" are a qualitative, new step for Soviet technology in our combat armaments.

[Plotnikov] You know, U.S. ships are not yet allowing our inspectors on board. What is your view of this attitude on the part of the Americans?

[Levchenko] Looking at the general picture and to judge by the reports carried in our news media, in many areas and fields we take the first step, and the Americans follow suit. So there is hope that in the near future our experts will visit U.S. ships. [passage omitted]

USSR Navy Day Celebrated 30 Jul

Yazov Issues Order of Day

PM3107111589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Jul 89 First Edition p 1

["USSR Defense Minister Order of the Day No 257"]

[Text] Comrade sailors and soldiers, petty officers and sergeants!
Comrade ensigns and warrant officers!
Comrade officers, admirals, and generals!
Comrade ship builders and ship repair workers and workers in the defense industry!
Comrade Navy veterans!

Today our country and its Armed Forces celebrate USSR Navy Day.

A notable feature of this holiday is that it is being celebrated in a period of truly revolutionary restructuring of all spheres of our life and the strenuous work of the party and Soviet people to implement the transformations outlined by the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. They include questions of ensuring the reliable defense of the Land of the Soviets as one of the state's most important functions.

In this situation the Navy personnel in single combat formation with the servicemen of the other branches of the USSR Armed Forces are directing their efforts toward the all-around raising of combat readiness and the consolidation of martial discipline and organization.

Aware of their responsibility to the Soviet people for the defense of the fatherland's sea borders, the military seamen are vigilantly doing their combat service on the expanses of the world's oceans, improving their military skill on sea voyages and at exercises, and safeguarding the security of the Soviet state and its allies against aggression.

I greet and congratulate you on your holiday—USSR Navy Day!

I wish the Navy personnel successes in combat and political training. I express the certainty that the navy servicemen, closely rallied around the Communist Party and the Soviet State, will in fact conduct the process of renewal in the USSR Armed Forces on the basis of the qualitative parameters of their development, overcome negative phenomena in the military collectives, and increase combat readiness to defend peace and socialism.

I wish the workers of the defense and ship building industry new labor successes to consolidate the country's defense capability.

I wish the Navy veterans successes in their noble work on the young people's military-patriotic education and their preparation for honorable service in the USSR Armed Forces.

To mark USSR Navy Day I decree:

That today, 30 July 1989, at 2200 hours local time festive firework displays be held in the capital of our motherland, the hero-city of Moscow, in the capitals of the union republics, in the hero-cities of Leningrad, Volgograd, Odessa, Sevastopol, Novorossiysk, Kerch, Tula, Smolensk, and Murmansk, the hero-fortress of Brest, and in the fleets and flotillas.

May our great motherland—the USSR—strengthen and flourish!

Glory to the USSR Armed Forces and their valiant Navy!

Long live the CPSU—the initiator and guarantor of perestroyka!
[Signed] Army General D.T. Yazov, USSR defense minister.

Admiral on Naval Preparedness

LD3107100289 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 30 Jul 89

[Text] Today is Soviet Navy Day, which has been marked as such on the last Sunday of July since 1939. Chief of the Soviet Navy Staff Admiral Makarov was speaking in an interview with Radio Moscow on the eve of the occasion:

[Begin recording of Makarov, in Russian with superimposed English translation] The Soviet naval strength now comprises high- tech nuclear- and diesel-powered missile- and torpedo-carrying submarines; general purpose, all-weather warplanes; aircraft- and helicopter-carrying cruisers, missile- and artillery-equipped heavy and light cruisers; destroyers; anti-submarine warships, and other classes of vessels and motorboats. The Soviet Union has to maintain its Navy in combat readiness. But it is also exerting great efforts to get the naval component into the negotiations intended to provide greater world security. [end recording]

Is the West likely to respond positively to Soviet initiatives?

[Begin Makarov recording] True, this country has advanced a range of concrete proposals aimed at restricting naval activities, reducing the naval arms race and spreading confidence-building measures to the navies too. The Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty countries, in its recent meeting in Bucharest, also voiced preparedness for broader dialogue on the naval aspect. Sadly, the NATO countries, which are reluctant to part with a large naval superiority, have been rejecting the very possibility of a dialogue in this area. In the meantime, discussions to produce solutions to the issue cannot be delayed too long, since a new round in the naval arms race could be thwarted by coordinated efforts and negotiation alone. [end recording]

Asked what was his own vision of the Soviet Navy's future, Admiral Makarov explained:

[Begin Makarov recording] So far, this country is in need of a navy, strong enough to warrant its security on the seas and to be an important factor in global strategic stability. It will be the navy of devoted seamen. [end recording]

That was Admiral Makarov, ending this report on Soviet Navy Day.

Commander Kapitanets Interviewed

LD2907204889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 29 Jul 89

[Text] [Announcer] Tomorrow is the sailors holiday: USSR Navy Day. At our microphone is Admiral of the Fleet Ivan Matveyevich Kapitanets, first deputy commander in chief of the Soviet Navy. Talking to him is our commentator Yuriy Gordeyev.

[Begin recording] [Gordeyev] Ivan Matveyevich, what is our country's Navy like today and who are the people who serve on our ships, in naval units?

[Kapitanets] Our homeland's Navy has the latest submarines, surface ships, aircraft, and assault craft. This is a reliable shield for protecting our maritime borders. The main thing in the Navy is people—devoted to our homeland and to our party, to our fatherland; these are the heirs of the glorious traditions of Russian and Soviet sailors who are currently maintaining with merit a combat watch in all of the oceans of the world.

[Gordeyev] We know that the Navy and the Armed Forces in general must be cut. Of course, our people are concerned by the question as to whether this might not be reflected on the security of our country.

[Kapitanets] The order and quantity of forces subject to reduction have been defined and confirmed by the USSR defense minister, with due account for preserving the fleets' fighting ability. The scale of the cuts in the Navy are not so substantial as to have a noticeable influence on methods of fulfilling its characteristic tasks within the scope of the Soviet defensive doctrine, I stress once again, within the scope of the Soviet defensive doctrine.

[Gordeyev] Ivan Matveyevich, restructuring is under way in the country, including in the Navy. The mail which we receive bears witness that not everything is progressing smoothly with you in this sense. What is slowing up perestroyka in the country's Navy?

[Kapitanets] It would be incorrect to divide perestroyka in the Army and Navy from perestroyka in society. The Armed Forces are a part of society, it can be said, its derivative. We say that the people and the Armed Forces are at one, for after all, the people and the Armed Forces are closely linked by the economic and social spheres. And so, if we are to speak of the factors that are slowing things up, then, clearly, two positions have to be singled out here. The first one: which is connected with the level of development of the economy, science, technology, and industrial potential of society, on which depends the quality of armaments and the material and technical provision of the Army and Navy, and also the social and everyday provision of military cadres.

The second position concerns slowing factors in the internal life of the Navy, its ships and units, that is, the way in which we utilize in practice the equipment and armaments entrusted to us, how we ourselves work in the period of perestroyka, how communists and Komsomol members work. The main slowing factor here, in my view, lies in outdated thinking on the part of a certain section of the people, and the absence on their part of initiative, independence, and creativity. The resolution of most of the issues on the ships and in the units depends on those who serve there.

[Gordeyev] We are still under the impression of the tragic events which recently occurred in the Navy.

[Kapitanets] The tragic events with the nuclear submarine "Komsomolets" have shown once more sailors' loyalty to military duty. We have drawn conclusions and are drawing them, and measures are being taken in order that both ships and people might not be lost in the Navy in peacetime, in order that the traditions of the Russian and Soviet Navy might be improved and developed. Allow me, taking advantage of my presence here, on behalf of the Military Council of the Navy, to congratulate on their holiday all those who are serving or have served in the Navy, who are on long-distance voyages, their families, relatives and friends, those who, in their line of work, are directly linked to the development of the Navy. I would like to wish everyone success in accomplishing the tasks with which we are faced by the party in perestroyka, and happy sailing. [end recording]

Zaykov Attends Ceremony

PM3107114189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Jul 89 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Standing Guard Over Sea Borders"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting to mark USSR Navy Day was held 28 July in the Moscow Palace of Youth. Representatives of the Moscow working people, servicemen of the capital's garrison, and Navy veterans assembled in the auditorium.

In the meeting presidium were L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU City Committee; O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of general staff of the USSR Armed Forces and USSR first deputy defense minister; Army General K.A. Kochetov, USSR first deputy defense minister; N.M. Luzhin, CPSU Central Committee department first deputy chief; Admiral of the Fleet A.I. Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; N.G. Chukardin, CPSU Central Committee department sector chief; generals, admirals, officers, and representatives of party, soviet, and public organizations.

The ceremonial meeting was opened by Admiral V.I. Panin, chief of the Navy Political Directorate.

L.V. Aristova, mother of two sons serving in the USSR Armed Forces; Sailor B.A. Beloturov, secretary of the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League organization of the engineering department of the ocean minesweeper "Rulevoy" which successfully fulfilled tasks of the defense of civilian shipping in the Persian Gulf; Rear Admiral K.T. Serin (retired), chairman of the council of Pacific Fleet veterans; and schoolboy Serezha Kiselev, member of the Moscow city club of young sailors.

The meeting was addressed by Admiral K.V. Makarov, chief of the main staff of the Navy.

New Mililtary, Fleet Commanders Identified

PM0108123189

[Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian on 1 August 1989 in its First Edition publishes on page one under the headline "Flags Over the Waves" a 700-word unattributed roundup of reports on 30 August provincial Navy Day celebrations. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA reports that the Leningrad celebrations were attended by Lieutenant General V. Mironov, first deputy commander of the Leningrad Military District; the Severomorsk celebrations were attended by Admiral F. Gromov, commander of the Northern Fleet; and the Baltiysk celebrations were attended by Vice-Admiral V. Yegorov, first deputy commander in chief of the Baltic Fleet. PMU records do not list any of these officers in the posts respectively attributed to them.

Adm Makarov Discusses Submarine Accidents

LD0108140189 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 1 Aug 89

[Text] Experts say that at any one time there are more than 100 submarines of different countries patrolling world seas. Some carry nuclear weapons board. A spate of recent accidents involving submarines shows how unpredictable could be the behavior of even the most sophisticated piece of equipment. Our reporter put it to the first deputy commander in chief of the Soviet Navy, Admiral Makarov, whether these sort of accidents were inevitable.

[Begin recording] [Makarov in Russian with superimposed English translation] There have been more than 2,000 accidents involving warships of different countries since the Second World War ended. As a result nearly 100 nuclear warheads and a few nuclear reactors now rest on sea beds. More than 70 warships sank, 6 of them nuclear-powered submarines, let alone huge loss of life. The U.S. Navy leads with nearly 800 accidents. Britain's Royal Navy had more than 380, and the Soviet Navy's toll is almost 80.

The Soviet rate of accidents involving nuclear-powered submarines has been reduced nearly by half in the past 10 years or so. This follows a huge effort by tens of thousands of people, and nonetheless the dramatic developments involving the loss of two Soviet submarines and a reactor failure on the third one are part of the same train of tragedy. No matter how far advanced can the equipment be, it can never be absolutely reliable. It is developed and maintained by people who have their own merits and drawbacks. They may be capable of feat, self-sacrifice, or high skills, but they are also given to breakdowns, fatigue, and error, and often to wrong decisionmaking, regardless of nationality.

[Correspondent] But don't you think such accidents can carry the risk of a nuclear ecological disaster or spark off an unprovoked military conflict?

[Makarov] Neither should be blown out of proportion. The findings both by Soviet and foreign experts showed that the ecological situation in the area of accidents involving Soviet submarines remains normal, so do radiation levels. However, the risks should not be underestimated either. No one could say with a fair amount of certainty what is awaiting all of us in the future. The Soviet Union believes the scope and area of naval activity by all countries, and mostly by the Soviet Union, the United States, and NATO countries, must be substantially reduced. This will have no telling effect on security levels but help towards positive shifts now taking place worldwide. This country is convinced that the number of submarines, both nuclear- and diesel-powered, now patrolling world seas is far too large. [end recording]

Admiral Makarov said his country was prepared for cutting their numbers on a compromise basis and would seek mutually acceptable solutions to these issues.

Moiseyev Meets, Answers Questions From Voters

PM0108121589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Aug 89 First Edition p 2

[Report by Major General A. Antonov: "Meetings With Servicemen"]

[Text] USSR People's Deputy Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of general staff of the USSR Armed Forces and first deputy defense minister, has met with his voters—the command and professorial and teaching staff and students of the F.E. Dzerzhinskiy Academy and the V.V. Kuybyshev Military Engineering Academy, and the servicemen of the Kantemir guards armored division named for Yu.V. Andropov.

He described the results of the work of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet session and imparted his impressions of these important events in the life of our country. Special attention was paid to the solution of defense questions and features of the development and improvement of the Armed Forces under present conditions. Army General M.A. Moiseyev answered numerous questions from the voters.

Larionov Receives Romanian, Libyan Sailors

PM0108115989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Aug 89 First Edition p 3

[Reports by "our correspondent" Captain 2d Rank V. Pasyakin under general heading: "Friendly Meetings"]

[Text] Sevastopol, 31 Jul—The official friendly visit of the Romanian Navy training ship "Mircea" to the hero-city of Sevastopol is continuing. The Romanian military seamen took part in the celebrations to mark Navy Day. Vice Admiral V. Larionov, first deputy commander of the Black Sea Fleet, gave a luncheon in honor of the Romanian guests.

The meetings between the Soviet and Romanian seamen took place in a warm, friendly atmosphere, first on board the guards' large ASW ship "Krasnyy Kavkaz," and then on board the training ship "Mircea."

Football and volleyball matches took place between teams of Soviet and Romanian seamen.

A delegation headed by Captain 1st Rank A. Shakshuki [name as transliterated], commander of the Libyan Navy, was with the Black Sea Fleet 29 through 31 July.

Captain 1st Rank A. Shakshuki visited Admiral M. Khropnulo, commander of the Black Sea Fleet. The Libyan guests took part in the celebrations to mark Navy Day, laid flowers at the obelisk of Glory on Sapun-Gora, viewed the "storming of Sapun-Gora on 7 May 1944" diorama and the "Defense of Sevastopol 1854-1855" panorama, and visited the "Slava" missile cruiser.

Admiral M. Khropnulo, commander of the Black Sea Fleet, gave a dinner in honor of the Libyan naval commander.

This is a U S Government publication Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U S Government Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals Items generally are processed from the first or best available source, it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated Items from foreign language sources are translated, those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source Times within items are as given by the source Passages in boldface or italics are as published

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630 Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue

U.S Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735,or write to P.O Box 2604, Washington, D.C 20013 Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C 20301 (Telephone (202) 373-3771, Autovon 243-3771)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States